

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 11, 1933

The House was called to order at 12 o'clock noon by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, who read the following communication from the Speaker:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,  
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1933.

I hereby designate Hon. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

HENRY T. RAINEY.

Mr. BULWINKLE assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D.D., offered the following prayer:

High above all, wrapped in tranquil infinity, our Father, yet in mercy Thou dost look upon this world with its tragedies, storms, and defeats. Give us an inspirational faith to believe that somewhere in this universe there is something waiting to fill our breasts with endless song. We praise Thee for the care and for the love which have gone into Thy children of this earth. Wherefore may we not glory in wealth, or in man, or in station, but glory in the everlasting gift with which we have been endowed. Thou, great Shepherd of the sheep, lend us strength and courage to smite temptation and guard Thy fold from polluting taint of every kind. Let us enjoy the unbroken flows of fresh, new grace while the light of eternity is burning in our breasts. In the name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4220. An act for the protection of Government records.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. RANDOLPH, may have 15 minutes to address the House on the subject of Mother's Day. The lady who first suggested Mother's Day and who is the founder of Mother's Day formerly lived in the gentleman's district in West Virginia. I hope no one will object to the request at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—I am not going to object to this request—but I would like to know from the gentleman if he has any information as to whether we will meet tomorrow or not.

Mr. BYRNS. I am inclined to think we may, but I am not absolutely positive about it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman can possibly give us that information later in the day?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes. While I have no definite information on the subject, it is entirely possible the President may send in a message tomorrow. I do not mean to say this will be done, but if he has the message ready I think it highly important that it should be received and that the bill, which would follow, should be taken up by the committee to which it would be referred in order to let that committee proceed at once with its consideration, because I take it they will want to hold some hearings on the measure.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman inform us with respect to the text of the message?

Mr. BYRNS. It is on the public works bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The public works bill?

Mr. BYRNS. That is my information. I hope the gentleman will understand I am not saying the message will come in tomorrow, but there is a possibility it may; and if it does, I think the House ought to be ready to receive it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not expect a message with respect to the tariff to come in at that time?

Mr. BYRNS. No; I do not. And if this request is granted, which I hope it will be, I trust there will be no further unanimous-consent requests to address the House. I am sure we shall be pleased to grant this request and then permit the committee to proceed with the appropriation bill, as it is hoped we may get through that measure today.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Further reserving the right to object, will the gentleman be reasonable with this side of the House if we desire a little time to discuss any message that may come in?

Mr. BYRNS. I take it we will have a lot of time at our disposal tomorrow, if we get through with the pending bill today.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object to this request, because I think the address of the gentleman is highly appropriate, I hope there will be no further unanimous-consent requests, as the Committee is anxious to conclude the consideration of the independent offices bill today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

## THE UNAPPLAUDED MOLDERS OF MEN

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling that I am treading on holy ground that I ask you to turn with me today for a few minutes to honor the immortal builder of all heroes—mother. Too long have mothers been the unapplauded molders of men, too long the true but unsung architects of destiny.

Volumes have been written about kings and emperors; historians have told of the exploits of a thousand heroes of battle; biographers have packed into colorful words the life and death of our statesmen; while painters have filled galleries with likenesses of our living great; but it remained for Miss Anna Jarvis, a West Virginia woman, untold years after the first mother had given birth to a son, to immortalize mother by having the Congress of the United States give recognition to Mother's Day through the display of our flag. The Congress established this memorial in 1914, and since that year on Mother's Day men and women turn from the turmoil of labor and by silent communion with that mother, living or dead, receive again from her the strength of mind and the pureness of soul that only can be bred in that greatest of all loves—that of a mother for her child.

Oh, if the historians, the painters, and sculptors could see through the outward acts of men to the source from which they derive their power of greatness, how different might be the lists of the honored and successful! How different would be the story of our national progress!

Behold the settling of the New World. With the Pilgrim father who sought his religious liberty in a new and unknown land came also the Pilgrim mother. She it was who endured the same hardships as her stronger mate; she it was who steadfast to her duty of wife and mother battled with him the cold of the cruel New England winters; she with him sacrificed the comparative peace and safety of the Old World for the dangers of the New; she with him fought the savage Indian; she kept his house, cooked his meals, bore him sons and daughters, and earnestly and faithfully reared them into new pioneers destined to build America.

Write, ye historians, of the mother of George Washington faithfully training that great man in the paths of duty and service. Record the story of the brave mother from the hills of western Virginia who sent her three sons to fight in the Continental Army when the British, under Colonel Tarleton, threatened invasion of the Shenandoah Valley with these words:

Go, my sons, and keep back the foot of the invader or see my face no more.

When this story was related to Washington in the darkest hours of the Revolution he said:

Leave me but a banner to plant upon the mountains of West Augusta and I will rally around me men who will lift our bleeding Nation from the dust and set her free.

Paint, ye artists, the settlement of the western America, but forget not that into that empire-building went not only the toil and blood of our pioneer men but that into it also went the immeasurable toil of pioneer women. Too often we visualize the skeletons that marked the trail across the prairies, the mountains, and deserts as the last remains of a Custer, a Lewis, a great frontiersman who died in glory defending his loved ones. Too often the true story written on the desert sands is the story of a mother's sacrifice, sometimes in the forefront of battle but more often in the burdensome strife of daily tasks that bent and broke her body. Too often the mute bones on the westward trail bespeak the death of a mother in childbirth. The story of the cradle rather than the report of the blunderbuss marks the westward course of empire.

O orators, if you would explain the greatness of Lincoln paint the vision of Nancy Hanks; fill your minds, if you can, with the glory of her mother love, catch the strains of the strange lullabies she sang to her unborn child. What fount of greatness can compare with hers? Biographers, if you would know from whence came the staunchness of Woodrow Wilson's soul, the breadth of his great vision, search out the secret gift of life and life's greatest ideals transmitted to him by his mother.

And so goes the story day in and day out, from the mothers of the great to the mothers of all men throughout the world. I wonder if any son ever knew the true depth of a mother's heart. Is there any force for righteousness and peace in the world equal to the force of a mother's daily teaching of obedience, of peace, of love, and of devotion to high ideals? Is there any nobler lesson taught than is taught by a mother's living example of sacrifice, of duty, and of love?

One September evening, several years ago, I stood on the railroad-station platform in Charleston, the capital of our State, just before the night train for Clarksburg was ready to pull out.

It was a delightful twilight, and I did not want to board the sleeper until the last minute. Just then a young man came swinging toward the car steps carrying his luggage. I know the boy, and it happened that he was leaving for Morgantown to enroll as a freshman at West Virginia University. It was the beginning of his first great life's adventure.

Standing close by, I heard the final words of parting. The father shook his son's hand with a final admonition, "I hope you'll make the football team, but go easy on the money, for your old dad has to settle all the bills." And this was a remark that many a father has made to his son. The sister said she hoped he might be pledged to the best fraternity on the campus. And then his sweetheart murmured—but I shall not report what they said, for we should never tell what sweethearts speak at parting time.

But, seriously, I shall never forget the words spoken by that mother to her boy, as she put her loving arms around his stalwart shoulders and said, "My boy, like your father, I want you to make the football team, and like your sister I want you to know the best people, but above all other things I hope you'll always remember to be a good boy."

When that mother spoke she did not mean "good boy" in the sense that she desired her son to be a wishy-washy sort of person. She meant what every mother has meant when she said those words. She simply wanted her boy to be honest, chivalrous, brave, and to stand foursquare against the evil winds that blow.

And thus do mothers write the living stories of men and nations. Behind the storm and strife and blustering of the actors most vividly before our eyes do we see the power of mother love and the fashioning of manhood and womanhood in mother's heart and hands.

I once heard a friend telling a young woman that he did not believe in any hereafter; that so far as he was concerned heaven and hell consisted of the joys and sorrows that every person experienced in this world and that when death stopped the movements of this life his body became only so much decaying matter and nothingness was the end. The young woman answered him in these words, "Do you mean to tell me that I shall never again see my mother?" And in that simple and yet boundless faith that mother and immortality were one and inseparable; in the sureness of her knowledge that when she had become weary of the labors of life there would be waiting the radiant face of her mother to comfort her and the loving arms to enfold her once more—never again to be separated in all eternity—in the light of that abiding hope and faith, all of the scientific arguments of my friend were of the nothingness of which he spoke. Against that mother-love logic was but the mere exercise of dried-up mathematics. And it is the same mother love that has enthroned the highest ideals in the hearts of all men. It has been the inspiration of the great and the comfort and hope of the lowly. Before the voice of a mother telling her son to "be a good boy" all of the pomp and splendor of the outward world fades away and

The tumult and the shouting dies,  
The captains and the kings depart,  
Still stands thine ancient sacrifice,  
An humble and a contrite heart.

Mother's Day is the most fitting memorial that can be raised to mothers of men. When we drive about the city of Washington we proceed from circle to circle, from monument to monument. Here stands a statue of Farragut, and here a likeness of Webster, and towering over them all is the giant spire honoring the great Washington. It is fitting that a nation should honor its heroes. But no statue can be raised to mother as enduring and as inspiring as the child each mother rears herself. No writer can enclose between the backs of any book all of the wisdom of a mother's teaching. No poet can capture all of the joys and sorrows of a mother's heart. No painter has the power to transmit to his canvas the beauty of a mother's face that glows in the memory of her dear ones, no matter how homely, how grotesque, or how blank and stupid that same face may have appeared to strangers. Even the wizardry of the sculptor's hand cannot endue his cold marble with the warmth of a mother's love. No; only a special day set apart for us, sons and daughters of mothers living and mothers dead, to commune again in our thoughts with those to whom we owe our all, is a fitting memorial to Mother. Memory alone holds for us the charm of her personality. Memory alone brings back the picture of those thousands of cares and daily tasks she did for us; the joyful laughter at our successes; the loving kindness of her manner. Memory alone brings back the mother we knew, and to bring back any other mother is only to rear an unworthy monument.

Today we are living in a world of personalities. Europe bristles with names of men rather than names of nations. Stalin of Russia, Mussolini of Italy, Hitler of Germany—who knows what influence their mothers had upon them? From whence their courage, their vision, their power? A mother tapped the sources of their personality, taught them the duties and tasks of life, guarded their bodies, and filled their minds with great thoughts.

Today in our Western Hemisphere it has been said that our President Roosevelt is the outstanding and dominant personality. Fortunate are we Americans to have his mother alive. This splendid mother of our President sees him as he magnificently commands our ship of state. She remembers daily the dreams she had for him in the yester-years when with her aid and guidance he was equipping himself for just such a momentous task of leadership. Humble, yet justly proud, she walks securely down the remaining miles on her highway of life, knowing that there follows along the trail a son who is perhaps destined to become one of the truly great leaders of mankind. And ever behind Roosevelt will remain his warm and glowing mother.

The late great poet, Henry Van Dyke, has expressed in tender words my wish and your wish when he says:

I cannot pay my debt  
For all the love that she has given;  
But Thou, love's Lord,  
Wilt not forget  
Her due reward—  
Bless her in earth and heaven.

[Applause.]

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1934

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5389) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. McCLINTIC in the chair.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

#### ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE COMMISSION

For continuing the construction of the Arlington Memorial Bridge across the Potomac River at Washington, authorized in an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River from a point near the Lincoln Memorial in the city of Washington to an appropriate point in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes", approved February 24, 1925 (43 Stat., p. 974), to be expended in accordance with the provisions and conditions to the said act, \$198,000, of which \$25,000 shall be available for widening and resurfacing the present road from the memorial entrance of the cemetery to the southeast corner of the cemetery, conditioned upon the State of Virginia completing the construction of the Lee Boulevard link of the Virginia State highway system to the same point; and not exceeding \$20,000 shall be available for clerical and accounting service, including all necessary incidental and contingent expenses, printing and binding, and traveling expenses, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Commission may procure supplies and services without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 41, sec. 5) when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$50: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay for the cost of reconstructing and paving Constitution Avenue east of Virginia Avenue, as provided in the approved project, except for such portions as may abut upon Government-owned property, and not in excess of 40 percent of the cost of such reconstructing and paving of that portion of the said street which so abuts.

Mr. UMSTEAD took the chair.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This section deals with a subject which I dare say many new Members are not familiar with. I can remember a year ago when those interested in this subject, and who were importuning Members to vote for the same, made the statement that the State of Virginia would contribute a certain portion of its cost. There was nothing of that nature included in the legislation, but it is interesting to know that this Government of taxpayers has expended possibly \$5,000,000 for the purpose of completing a macadam, hard-surface highway to Mount Vernon, serving principally the citizens of Alexandria and Washington.

In addition I am advised that we are paying the salaries of those who police the highway. We purchased the territory adjacent, and I cannot understand why it is necessary to maintain in what some might term "in perpetuity" this highway.

We not only spend money for the completion of the bridge but, if I am correctly advised, the State of Virginia did not even furnish the ground where the other end of the bridge rests.

I do not wish to criticize the distinguished gentleman from Virginia in charge of the bill. I have as high a regard for him as any person that I know of; but I am interested in the welfare of the people, and I do not think this kind of discrimination ought to go on. I think the gentleman from Virginia, in charge of the bill, ought to advise the new Members how long we are going to maintain this Commission and the activities that, in my opinion, ought never to have been authorized in the construction of the bridge.

It seems to me that there ought to be some way of bringing the matter to a conclusion. I am hoping the gentleman in charge of the bill will enlighten the House as to how long we are to continue appropriating year after year money for this purpose, when the bridge is about completed and the highway is built and the road being traveled and used daily.

Mr. BEAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I yield.

Mr. BEAM. How long has this Commission been in existence?

Mr. McCLINTIC. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE], who was in charge of the bill originally, can answer that; but I think 4 or 5 years.

Mr. BEAM. Can the gentleman state the amount of money expended?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I hope the gentleman from Virginia will give us the amount. Every Member of the House is entitled to the information when we are asked to make this appropriation.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. This outburst of my good friend from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] in the interest of the taxpayers is very interesting. Members of Congress who were here, as he was and as I was when the legislation was passed, know that it was never contemplated or stated in this House by anybody who had any authority to make any such statement that the State of Virginia would pay any part of the cost of building the Arlington Memorial Bridge. It was entirely a Government project. It was considered carefully by a legislative committee of the House. It was not a project fostered by the people of the State of Virginia or in the interest of the people of Virginia.

It is true that one end of that great memorial does rest on the sacred and holy, historic ground of Virginia and the beautiful boulevard that is a credit to the Nation, which is used daily by thousands of citizens of the United States, not only Virginians but Oklahomans and all other citizens, to visit the great Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and the home of the Father of Our Country. It begins at the Virginia end of the Memorial Bridge and goes to Mount Vernon. It is true that a few motorcycle officers patrol that Government boulevard at a very small expense. The original project, I think, called for an expenditure of about \$12,000,000 or \$14,000,000. The project is practically complete. This practically completes the structure, except some very drastic curtailments in the project made in the bill last year and this year with my entire and hearty approval, in the interest of economy—some ornamentation, which has been taken out, and some paving.

Everything has been deleted from the project that it was possible to take out without absolutely destroying it. When the constituents of the various Members of Congress come to Washington, this beautiful Capital City, and visit its beautiful memorials and parks and drive across that wonderful bridge and out that boulevard to the home of George Washington, not a Virginian but an American, I do not think any Member of the House need apologize to them for the few dollars that were spent to build that beautiful Memorial Bridge and highway. [Applause.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. By reason of a committee assignment which I hold in the House I am, ipso facto, a member of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission. When this matter originated a few years ago, I was a member of that same committee but not its chairman and, therefore, not a member of this Commission. I recall that I took the floor and opposed this proposition originally. I did not believe that this sum of money should be expended for the construction of this bridge, especially entirely out of Federal funds. But that contention was overruled by the vote of the House, and the expenditure was authorized. The bridge has been constructed and is practically complete. As a member of that Commission I have opposed the approval of several items of expense which, in my judgment, were not justified. One of these was an item of about \$10,000, which was to be used in having certain advertising matter engraved upon the

stone of that bridge, setting forth the names of those who had done certain features of the work. It occurred to me that that information might well be preserved in official records and that the firms who were honored with that work should not have their names perpetuated in an advertising way at the expense of the United States Government. The work having been begun, and the work now being near completion, naturally it devolves upon the Congress of the United States to see that it is carried out as economically as possible in accordance with the original plan. I hope it can soon be completed, and I trust that we shall continue to eliminate any items of useless expense.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, on page 5, line 23, the word "to" should be stricken out and the word "of" substituted. It is a typographical error. I offer that amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WOODRUM: Page 5, line 23, after the word "conditions", strike out the word "to" and insert in lieu thereof the word "of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

For three Commissioners and other personal services in the District of Columbia, including personal services required for examination of Presidential postmasters, and including not to exceed \$1,000 for employment of expert examiners not in the Federal service on special subjects for which examiners within the service are not available, and for personal services in the field; for necessary traveling expenses, including those of examiners acting under the direction of the Commission, and for expenses of examinations and investigations held elsewhere than at Washington, including not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of public officials when specifically directed by the Commission; for furniture and other equipment and repairs thereto; supplies, advertising; telegraph, telephone, and laundry service; freight and express charges; street-car fares not to exceed \$300; stationery; purchase and exchange of law books, books of reference, directories, subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals, not to exceed \$1,000; charts; purchase, exchange, maintenance, and repair of motor trucks, motorcycles, and bicycles; garage rent; postage stamps to prepay postage on matter addressed to Postal Union countries; special-delivery stamps; and other like miscellaneous necessary expenses not hereinbefore provided for, \$1,028,000: *Provided*, That no details from any executive department or independent establishment in the District of Columbia or elsewhere to the Commission's central office in Washington or to any of its district offices shall be made during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, but this shall not affect the making of details for service as members of the boards of examiners outside the immediate offices of the district managers: *Provided further*, That the Civil Service Commission shall have power in case of emergency to transfer or detail any of its employees to or from its office or field force.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HOEPEL: In section 1, page 10, line 7, substitute a comma for the period after the word "force" and add the following: "*Provided*, That in such transfer or detail of any of its employees husband and wife shall not be assigned to duty in the same division or section of any bureau, office, or institution of the Civil Service Commission."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and changes the fundamental law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard upon the point?

Mr. HOEPEL. I do, sir. I contend that this does not change the fundamental law. It merely makes this present provision elastic. That is my contention.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment clearly changes existing law, and the Chair is therefore of the opinion that it is legislation. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Federal Board for Vocational Education, \$2,487,700.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to ask a question or two. I should like to ask

the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations or someone who knows about this, with respect to this matter: I have received some complaints and some very interesting questions from people who are highly interested. In reading this section and getting from it what I can, it seemed to me that the committee has made the reductions very carefully and without any apparent favor to any item. Is that correct?

Mr. WOODRUM. Is the gentleman speaking now of the Federal Vocational item?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. The reduction carried in that item is accounted for by additional salary reduction, for one thing, and what is equivalent to a 15-percent reduction of the amount of Federal contribution to the States.

Mr. JENKINS. I notice that in the salaries the reduction is about uniform, but where there is a reduction from \$1,500,000 to \$1,275,000 in vocational-education work in agricultural home economics, it would appear to me that that reduction is larger than any other reduction.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is exactly 15 percent.

Mr. JENKINS. Am I safe in assuming that the reductions are uniform down along the line, so that no department would have any right to complain that it has been unjustly discriminated against?

Mr. WOODRUM. That is correct.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries and expenses in accordance with the provisions of the "Agricultural Marketing Act", approved June 15, 1929 (U.S.C., supp. V, title 7, secs. 521-535f), not including the salaries of members of the Federal Farm Board, except the salary of the member designated as chairman, and the act creating a Division of Cooperative Marketing in the Department of Agriculture, approved July 2, 1926 (U.S.C., supp. VI, title 7, secs. 451-457), including stenographic reporting services to be obtained by the Board through the Civil Service or by contract; not to exceed \$750 for newspapers and clippings; membership fees or dues in organizations which issue publications to members only or to members at a lower price than to others, payment for which may be made in advance; manuscripts, data, and special reports by purchase or by personal services without regard to the provisions of any other act; to procure supplies and services without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 41, sec. 5) when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$50; purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and motor trucks to be used only for official purposes; typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices, including their repair and exchange; garage rental in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; traveling expenses, including attendance at meetings, concerned with the work of the Federal Farm Board; payment of actual transportation expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem to cover subsistence and other expenses while in conference and en route from and to his home to any person other than an employee or a member of an advisory commodity committee whom the Board may from time to time invite to the city of Washington and elsewhere for conference and advisory purposes in furthering the work of the Board; the employment of persons, firms, and others for the performance of special services, including legal services and other miscellaneous expenses, all unexpended balances of appropriations for the Federal Farm Board, not exceeding \$1,050,000, are hereby made available for the purposes enumerated in this paragraph: *Provided*, That during the fiscal year 1934, when the Federal Farm Board requires cooperative work by any department or independent establishment of the Government within the scope of the functions of such department or establishment and which such department or establishment is unable to perform within the limits of its appropriations, the Federal Farm Board may transfer from this appropriation to such department or establishment, with the approval of the head thereof, such sum or sums for direct expenditure during the fiscal year 1934, as may be necessary for the performance of such additional work: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay any salary in excess of \$10,000 per annum, or any salary in excess of \$8,500 per annum except to the member of the Board designated as the chairman and not to exceed eight other officers or employees.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM: Page 18, line 24, after the word "employees", strike out the period, insert a comma, and add "which number, in addition to any officers or employees who, under existing law may be so appointed and compensated, may hereafter be appointed and compensated without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and the Civil Service laws."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, in explanation of the amendment, I would say it is simply a clarifying amendment. It does not affect the amount of the appropriation or the amount of salary. The language is suggested by the Comptroller General, because of the last proviso on page 18, which limits the number of \$10,000 positions in this new set-up.

May I say that in the different boards and organizations which have been consolidated, there were sixteen \$10,000 positions or executive positions, the basis salary of which was \$10,000. Under this new set-up seven of those positions are eliminated, and the proviso at the bottom of page 18 limits the number of executive positions.

The language which has been suggested by the Comptroller is merely clarifying. It does not affect the appropriation at all.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This is a clarifying amendment. It helps make the Civil Service Act ineffective. I hope the House will not adopt the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, General Accounting Office, \$3,280,000.

Mr. CARPENTER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I will say by way of apology that when we were considering the paragraph regarding the Federal Farm Board the Clerk skipped to the next section before I could ask a question.

I note on page 17, line 22, this provision:

Payment of actual transportation expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem to cover subsistence and other expenses while in conference and en route from and to his home to any person other than an employee or a member of an advisory commodity committee whom the Board may from time to time invite to the city of Washington and elsewhere for conference and advisory purposes in furthering the work of the Board.

I know that anyone subpoenaed here should be reimbursed for his expenses. They should be provided for, but I would like to ask the committee to enlighten us why this section is necessary to pay the expenses of visitors whom the Farm Board may want to invite to Washington or elsewhere.

Mr. WOODRUM. Under the Agricultural Marketing Act the Federal Farm Board is authorized to create from time to time, as conditions may require, advisory commodity committees for the purpose of advising with various groups of agriculturists on problems particularly related to their particular commodity or activity. This language permits the Federal Farm Board to bring to Washington, whenever in its judgment it is necessary, agricultural experts to give information to those advisory groups, and to reimburse them for their traveling expenses and a small per diem.

The total amount expended under that in 1932 was less than \$2,000. So, figuring the scope of the work, it is really an insignificant matter, and the Federal Farm Board tells us it enables them to bring witnesses here rather than to go to the expense of conducting expensive hearings in the field oftentimes when they are considering these specific matters.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, the different points of view which Members of this body entertain upon public questions but reflects the fact that the people as a whole have varied interests and varied points of view.

I myself have never been able to understand how anybody could seriously criticize the work of the Federal Trade Commission. It has long seemed to me that this Commission, fully as much as any governmental agency, stands between the consuming masses of this country and the moneyed barons who through over-watered corporate structures all too frequently seek to prey upon them.

I myself think that if this Commission had never done any other thing than to have investigated the Insull properties it would have justified its existence and every dollar that has ever been appropriated for it.

I have very great respect for the Chairman of this Subcommittee on Appropriations. His judgment has been my judgment on many important questions where principles of right and wrong were involved. At the last session of Congress the subcommittee of which he is chairman cut down the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission by some \$500,000, as I recollect. Undoubtedly the subcommittee would not have recommended that cut unless it had felt justified, and such was my respect for the judgment of the chairman and the subcommittee itself, and such was my desire to follow the policy of economy as outlined by this House that I voted against an amendment offered on the floor of the House to increase that appropriation.

When I voted as I did I thought the reduction would in no way interfere with the continued investigation of the power companies. I think it was the judgment of the subcommittee that they would not cripple the Trade Commission by that cut in that particular work.

Now, my judgment again follows that of the committee. The committee has since found, I believe, that that cut would have seriously interfered with such investigation; and by my personal investigation I have since found that such a cut would have seriously interfered. I now desire to commend this subcommittee for increasing the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission. I may say if they had not done so, I would have introduced an amendment to increase the appropriation recommended at the last session by \$500,000 to make possible further and complete investigation of the power companies. I repeat that this highly desirable investigation work is sufficient justification for all the expenses incurred by this Commission; and I believe that when it has completed its investigation of the power interests it will have given enough facts to the public to enable it, through the proper authorities, to take such steps as will make it impossible for the great public utility companies to impose rates upon the consuming public based upon watered stock and an interlocking of corporate structure, which is in no measure justified by any sound business principle.

May I express my appreciation to the chairman of this subcommittee and the whole subcommittee for their very wise conclusion to restore to this bill an appropriation item which will enable the Federal Trade Commission to proceed with its investigation of the power corporations?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. If the gentleman will examine the hearings, he will find that this Commission in its investigation of the utility companies has disclosed escaped taxes more than sufficient to pay the expenses of the inquiry.

Mr. BEEDY. Judge Healey has made a very interesting report quite recently along this line. The revelations following an investigation of the Insull properties were of vital interest and consequence to my own State of Maine. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have no word of criticism against the Federal Trade Commission in their investigations of the Power Trust. It is not a question of what the Federal Trade Commission has done in the Power Trust investigation that I am interested in.

#### COMMISSION DIVERTED FROM CHARTED COURSE

The gentleman from Maine stated a few moments ago that this was a very helpful commission because it stood between the consumers and the greedy profiteers. It was organized for this purpose, and for a few years it did perform the duties set out for it by the law, but during the past few years the Federal Trade Commission has diverted from its chartered and legal course to a course of action that is absolutely in violation of the law. In the portion of the bill relating to the Federal Trade Commission, page 21, nowhere will you find that an appropriation is made for the

Federal trade practice work. If it was mentioned, we could reach it with a point of order. They will not mention it in the law. If they were to mention it, we would probably have stricken it out. Their Federal trade practice work they are doing is in plain violation of the law. This is not discussed or mentioned in the appropriation bill. It seems to be the custom of the Commission to get the appropriation for something else and then divert it to this illegal work.

May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee why the language about Federal trade practice conferences is not contained in the bill?

Mr. WOODRUM. I may say to the gentleman that the language carried in lines 8 and 9 on page 21 is the same language we have had all the time.

Mr. PATMAN. Perhaps the trade practice conference work is known to be so destructive to the general welfare the Federal Trade Commission does not dare ask for a specific appropriation for that purpose.

The statement is made that the Federal Trade Commission stands between the consumer and the profiteers. Let us see if the Commission is doing this.

#### INVESTIGATION INSTEAD OF PUNISHMENT

What does a law violator want? He does not want punishment. He does not want to go to jail. He does not want to pay a fine. He wants to be investigated. So the Federal Trade Commission has a complaint filed against him and the Federal Trade Commission immediately sends out its advance men to make an investigation. This takes probably a year or two. A report is made to the Federal Trade Commission. The Commission holds hearings and then the Federal Trade Commission makes a report that violations of the law are disclosed. Are these people punished? No; these people are not punished. The case is turned over to the Department of Justice and the Department of Justice's advance agents go out and make another investigation. They read these reports and they read this testimony, and by the time the Department of Justice gets it in shape where something can be done the statute of limitations has run against every criminal violation and the cases are dropped.

I would like for the gentleman to name me just one person who has paid \$1 of fine or has gone to jail 1 hour during the last 5 years because of the activities of the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. BEEDY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman do that?

#### SPECIFIC CASES

Mr. BEEDY. I was going to ask the gentleman if he would tell us of one case in which he feels this Commission has failed to do its duty. It is all right to talk generally—

Mr. PATMAN. I can name 50 cases.

Mr. BEEDY. What does the gentleman have in mind?

Mr. PATMAN. One of them is the Cottonseed Oil Trust that the Federal Trade Commission organized. They had the members of that industry come before them, sitting there as members of a group, with a member of the Commission presiding, and the members of the group declared the object was to make rules and regulations for the government of their industry that would set the price that the consumers must pay and set the price that the farmers must sell to them their raw products for. Thereby entering into a conspiracy against both consumers and farmers. I believe that there are more than 50 cases involving the sale of comforts and necessities of life similar to the cottonseed oil case. It is a trust organizer.

Mr. McFARLANE. The American Petroleum Institute also went before the Federal Trade Commission, and that is another illustration.

#### ILLEGAL PRACTICES SHOULD BE DISCONTINUED

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; that is another case, and the Supreme Court of Alabama held that the Cottonseed Oil Trust was illegal. The highest courts in practically all the States, and in the United States have held similar rules to be in violation of the law.

I wish the Federal Trade Commission would abandon its illegal practices. It can be a useful body if it functions in

the interest of the consumers and not, as it has been, in the interest of trusts and monopolies.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I am not unfriendly to the Federal Trade Commission. I think, however, it ought to be brought to the attention of the House why the committee reduced this appropriation to \$500,000 at the last session of Congress.

The item in the present bill carries \$920,000 for the Federal Trade Commission for the current year. The representatives of the Commission, when they came before the Subcommittee on Appropriations in January last pointed out that there were three or four investigations, including the utilities, the chain stores, and, I believe, the cottonseed investigation, and perhaps the cement investigation, which they expected to complete out of the present appropriation and before June 30 of this year.

The Federal Trade Commission has expanded its personnel wonderfully since it was created. It is my present recollection that the number of employees of the Commission, as given in the hearings of January last, was around 418.

It was testified that the appropriation for the coming fiscal year contemplated 427 employees.

I want to invite attention to pages 79 to 87 of the hearings, held during the present extra session of Congress, on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1934, where the cost of the several investigations by the Federal Trade Commission is given.

I feel sure that not many Members of the House know the enormous cost of these investigations to the taxpayers of the country. I am not saying that any investigation should not have been had, but the question I am presenting is whether the Federal Trade Commission, in the first place, is the best agency to make many of these investigations and whether some of them are not made at too great a cost to the taxpayers.

During the hearings in January last it was stated that the utilities investigation cost around \$1,625,000. That is an enormous sum of money. During the present year the amount was reduced to \$1,250,000.

However, on page 86 of the hearings the total cost is given at \$1,598,677.13. This investigation began under a Senate resolution of February 15, 1928, more than 5 years ago. I think that if an investigation is justified that it ought to be expedited and that the main, essential facts could be secured at a very much reduced cost. Whenever this appropriation comes up for consideration in the House and when one speaks for economy in connection therewith, there is always some intimation that that person is opposed to the utilities investigation and is in some way dominated by the Power Trust. Now, I have never been afraid of my own integrity, and want to emphasize over and over again that I favor all investigations where they are necessary, but I assert in the first place that these investigations have been too expensive, and in the second place in practically all of these investigations the statute of limitations has run, so that no criminal prosecutions follow.

Now, let us examine the chain-store investigation. It was stated on page 72 of the hearings that this investigation would cost around \$750,000. On page 80 of the hearings a more detailed statement is given, which shows the cost to have been \$867,358.74. This investigation was authorized by a Senate resolution of May 12, 1928. This was 5 years ago, and the investigation has not as yet been completed. I assert with great positiveness that five or six good investigators, together with a few experts, could have made this investigation, assembled all the material facts, and made a report in a much shorter time and for one fifth of the expenditure.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that the facts and information compiled by the Commission 3 years ago in that investigation are not now useful?

Mr. HASTINGS. That is quite true, and I do not believe there is a Member of this House who believes that this

enormous sum of the taxpayers' money was necessary to have been expended in this chain-store investigation.

A few days ago we saw in the public press a statement by the Secretary of the Interior with reference to the bids for cement for the continuation of the work on the Boulder Dam.

If you will turn to the bottom of page 79 of the hearings, you will find that the Federal Trade Commission by Senate resolution of February 16, 1931, was directed to make an investigation of the cement industry.

This investigation began more than 2 years ago. The Commission should have assembled all the facts and should have made a report, so that the Secretary of the Interior would be able to secure from the Commission now all the material facts.

What I am bringing to your attention is that it requires too long a time for the Commission to make these investigations and they are too expensive. This cement investigation up to the present time has cost \$68,734.36. I feel sure that a small body of men, properly equipped, could have made this investigation, collected all the material facts, and made a report within a few months.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. What was accomplished by reason of that investigation? Did the Federal Trade Commission have the Cement Trust prosecuted or was an effort made to disclose the facts to the public?

Mr. HASTINGS. I have never heard of any prosecutions as a result of this investigation.

Mr. PATMAN. And nobody went to jail or paid a fine?

Mr. HASTINGS. No; and the Secretary of the Interior, in a statement recently given out, makes the statement that all bidders for cement for the continuation of work on the Boulder Dam project submitted the same bid and that, therefore, there must be a Cement Trust, or perhaps I should say a price understanding.

The point I am trying to emphasize is that I am not unfriendly to any one of these legitimate investigations. I am in entire sympathy with them, but here is what happens; some Member of the Senate introduces a resolution providing for an investigation of the Federal Trade Commission without any estimate of the cost and without making provision for the expense of the investigation.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. McFARLANE. Does not the gentleman think that the Department of Justice ought to take notice of the facts found by the Commission and prosecute?

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman from Texas will examine the time when these several resolutions were passed and then notice the dates of the reports of the Commission, he will find that by the time the Commission has assembled the facts and made the reports the statute of limitations has run in almost every case.

I would not say that these reports have been of no practical value but will say that I think the investigations ought to be expedited so that if it be found that there have been any violations of the criminal statutes the parties criminally liable could be prosecuted.

Mr. McFARLANE. Does not the gentleman think that the Congress of the United States ought to remedy the situation so that the Federal Trade Commission can really function and cooperate with the Department of Justice?

Mr. HASTINGS. I think the Federal Trade Commission has too many employees. If you will examine the breakdown of the Bureau of the Budget in making its estimates for the Federal Trade Commission you will find the detailed figures showing that this Commission has perhaps more higher paid employees than any other commission for which we make an appropriation.

I think the Department of Justice itself in many of these cases could better make the investigation by its experts. All of the essential facts could be secured in a much shorter time and at much less expense.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Is not the principal object of the investigation by the Federal Trade Commission to determine whether any violation of law has occurred and to furnish the Department of Justice with the facts?

Mr. HASTINGS. I think that is one of the principal reasons for the investigation.

Mr. MOTT. If that is the case why could not the Department of Justice make the investigation itself?

Mr. HASTINGS. That is what I am trying to emphasize. I think in a great many instances the investigation could better be done by the Department of Justice; but in certain cases I feel sure that the Federal Trade Commission is better equipped. I want to be entirely fair with the Commission, but I was unwilling to permit the criticism to go unnoticed, on account of the reduced appropriations reported in the last session of Congress, without an explanation.

The committee thought that \$500,000 would be sufficient for the Federal Trade Commission for the coming fiscal year, provided that if any special investigation should be ordered by the Senate, provision should be made for funds for the payment of each investigation.

You will note that the following proviso is added to the paragraph making appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission:

*Provided, That hereafter no new investigation shall be initiated by the Commission as the result of a legislative resolution except the same be a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.*

The thought being that a more careful estimate would be made of the cost and an appropriation made to meet the expenses.

Mr. BEEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. BEEDY. I commend the committee for the careful judgment they exercised, and I know they proceeded in good faith; but, in discussing this question, does not the gentleman think it is fair to the House and to the Federal Trade Commission to say that that body was never designed as a prosecuting agency? They could not prosecute. If there is anything to prosecute on the facts, it is for the Department of Justice.

Mr. HASTINGS. In answer to the gentleman from Maine, my criticism is that the investigations by the Federal Trade Commission have not been expeditious enough. They have been too tedious; it has taken them too long to find the facts, and by the time the facts are found and the report made the statute of limitations has run, so that no prosecution could follow. When Members of the House criticize the amount of the appropriation, I feel that they do not know how much has been expended in these several investigations. You will find a list of investigations on pages 79 to 87, inclusive, of the hearings. I do not have the time to examine each and discuss them. I believe that all will agree that these investigations have cost altogether too much money.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield for another short question?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. What is the object of the investigations of the Federal Trade Commission other than to ascertain whether or not the law has been violated?

Mr. HASTINGS. There are many other reasons stated in the act creating the Commission or in the resolutions which provide for the investigations.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the Chair?

Mr. HASTINGS. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman know whether or not the Federal Trade Commission has ever recommended to either branch of Congress certain legislation for the purpose of bringing about changes?

Mr. HASTINGS. I do not recall any. Of course, I am on the Committee on Appropriations, which does not have leg-

islative authority. I am not familiar with what, if any, legislation has been recommended by the Federal Trade Commission to the legislative committees of the House or to Congress, nor have I examined the report of the Federal Trade Commission to ascertain what recommendations, if any, it has made.

In addition to the 3 or 4 investigations to which I have especially referred, the Members can refer to the hearings, at the pages I have indicated, and they will find a complete report of all special investigations by the Federal Trade Commission and the cost of each.

The cottonseed investigation, frequently referred to, was under Senate resolution of October 21, 1929, and cost \$141,009.81. This investigation was so voluminous and so long-drawn-out that it resulted in no benefit and no prosecutions.

I have made a somewhat hurried examination of the investigations reported in the hearings on pages 79 to 87, and I have not found in any case where the Commission examined the facts and reported them and where a criminal prosecution followed.

Let me repeat again that I favor, by some agency, every legitimate investigation and by the Federal Trade Commission those investigations where they are best equipped to make them. However, I repeat that it is the duty of Congress to the taxpayers of the country to make an estimate as to the cost of these investigations when they are ordered.

I felt that it was my duty to make this explanation of the attitude of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, which prepared the independent offices appropriation bill in January and February last, and recommended a reduced appropriation. The committee thought the amount adequate for the general expenses of the Commission, provided that additional appropriations were made when concurrent resolutions were passed providing for special investigations.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this section close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I think the function of the Federal Trade Commission is one of the most vital things in our body politic. I look upon the functions of the Federal Trade Commission as a gland in the body politic, and when that Commission fails to function, then the whole political and business structure of the country becomes diseased. I say that the business structure of this country, through the operation of price-fixing measures on the part of the big industrial organizations in the country, has become diseased, and I would point out to you a few of the effects of that disease. We know that the price of commodities in many cases is fixed and that they do not follow the influence of the law of supply and demand through the operation of competition. If you are engaged in a primary productive activity in this country, such as agriculture, lumbering, or mining, you will find that apparent.

I know that in the West hides today are rotting, and the price of leather is fixed; that we are paying 60 cents a pound for common side leather and a dollar a pound for sole leather. I know that the price of lead is 3 cents a pound, and I know that the price of paint ingredients, white lead and red lead, is fixed at 14½ cents a pound. I know that there are enough buildings in the cities and farming communities of the West deteriorating and decaying for the lack of paint that would consume all of the lead produced in this country if the law of supply and demand could operate to supply the need for paint. I know that we could use the idle labor and surplus lead to make paint if small enterprises and small business organizations could be allowed to produce under the law of supply and demand protected from unfair competition and unfair trade practices. These big industrial organizations, by profiteering at the expense of the producing industries, have piled up huge surpluses, drained from the producers of the country. They made such large profits that they could not disburse those profits through the medium of dividends, and were forced to stock split-ups and dividends, and the public was enticed into a

speculative market, and profits were made on what was taken from our producers. When the banking interests of the country saw that we were getting into an unsafe speculative market and sought to check the flow of money to these speculators and raised the discount rates, money continued to flow into these speculative markets and prices were driven up to unsafe levels. Our writers called that bootleg money, because they did not know the source of it. It was finally determined that this money was flowing from the surpluses of these big manufacturing organizations, attracted by the high rates paid by the speculators, and as our markets continued to rise to unsafe levels we were finally overtaken by the crash that has brought ruin and destruction to the banking and financial institutions of the country. If the Federal Trade Commission would function, if the Department of Justice would do the thing that the Interstate Commerce Commission did with our big railroad companies when they promulgated their rule for safety appliances, we would be in much better condition than we are today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes more.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the 2 minutes that the Chairman reserved for me in closing the debate in 7 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. It is possible to curb these unfair trade practices, because we have done that thing in respect to the operation of the big transportation companies. When the Interstate Commerce Commission promulgated its safety-appliance rules and the big transportation corporations refused to comply, they were checked up and haled into court on counts for failure to comply with the safety-appliance rules, and they were penalized, and as a result they were forced to comply. If we would broaden and strengthen the laws under which the Federal Trade Commission operates and give this country a real Federal Trade Commission, many of the things that we are suffering from now on the farms of the West and in the producing industries of the country would be cured and we would be protected.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Did I understand the gentleman to say he is opposed to price fixing?

Mr. WHITE. I certainly am opposed to price fixing. I am in favor of the operation of the law of supply and demand, through unrestricted competition in this country, as a matter of readjustment to bring prices into line.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Is the gentleman opposed to fixing farm prices?

Mr. WHITE. I think that is an expedient that we must use.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the Federal Trade Commission has done anything to remedy the situation of which he complains?

Mr. WHITE. I should say it has not. It has had one investigation after another, and the whole benefit has been emasculated by the matter of procedure.

Mr. MOTT. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the Federal Trade Commission is not functioning?

Mr. WHITE. It certainly is not.

Mr. MOTT. Is the gentleman in favor of this appropriation?

Mr. WHITE. I am.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

General administrative expenses: For 11 Commissioners, secretary, and for all other authorized expenditures necessary in the execution of laws to regulate commerce, including 1 chief counsel, 1 director of finance, and 1 director of traffic at \$10,000 each per annum, traveling expenses, and contract stenographic reporting

services; \$2,250,000, of which amount not to exceed \$2,155,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, exclusive of special counsel, for which the expenditure shall not exceed \$50,000; not exceeding \$3,000 for purchase and exchange of necessary books, reports, and periodicals; not exceeding \$100 in the open market for the purchase of office furniture similar in class or kind to that listed in the general-supply schedule: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia if suitable space is provided by the Public Buildings Commission.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 23, line 24, strike out "\$2,250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,750,000."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is not to either decrease or increase the general appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission. While this amendment itself would decrease this appropriation \$500,000, I expect to offer another amendment on page 27 which will transpose or transfer this \$500,000 reduction, if it is made, so as to increase the amount allotted to the land-appraisal department, and raise that from \$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000.

My reason for offering the amendment at this time is based on a careful reading of the testimony before the committee, shown on pages 104, 105, and those following of the hearings, which shows that it was the intention of the committee. This section provides for an appropriation of \$2,250,000, \$2,155,000 of which may be expended in the District of Columbia for personal services. The reason the committee did that, according to the hearings, was this: The Commission proposes to bring from throughout the country, from every nook and corner thereof, to Washington every one of your constituents who has a case pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission, instead of sending a Commissioner or an examiner down into the country to hold a hearing. For instance, it is shown in the testimony of one of the witnesses that they will transfer hearings that are already set at Wichita Falls, Tex., to Washington; from New York to Washington; from Kansas City to Washington; from Florida to Washington; from Raleigh, N.C., to Washington; from Columbia, S.C., to Washington; and from Jacksonville, Fla., to Washington. I undertake to say it is going to be infinitely unjust and unfair to require all persons who have cases before the Interstate Commerce Commission to bring a large number of witnesses to Washington instead of having an examiner sent down into the country to have the hearing there and submit the case to the Commission.

Mr. WOODRUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman is complaining about the committee cutting money out of the appropriation, which will necessitate those hearings being held in Washington, yet the effect of the gentleman's amendment is to further cut the fund from which they get the money to hold hearings in the field. The gentleman's amendment cuts out an additional amount.

Mr. MAY. I take the position that it is not necessary to have \$2,250,000 or \$2,155,000 expended in Washington while they curtail the land-appraisal department \$1,313,000, and which will result in the discharge of 600 of the 913 employees of the land-appraisal department; that the difference in the cost of the hearings before an examiner in the country in the hundreds of pending cases, as compared with bringing them to Washington, justifies the cut. In view of the approaching legislation we are about to have, which will bring about a coordination and consolidation of the railroads into four great trunk systems, you will find a discontinuance of branch lines and the elimination of industry and manufactures out on branch lines everywhere. It will bring about the necessity of a reappraisal of all branch lines and it will coordinate everything in Washington, and this is the first step. That is the reason why I think it should not be done. I think this House should give careful and serious consideration to this amendment, because it simply means that instead of having hearings before an examiner out in the country they must bring two or

three hundred people from the State of Texas, for instance, to Washington or from California to Washington as witnesses, and it will take thousands and thousands of dollars out of the pockets of the people in order to make it convenient for the Commission to have everything heard in Washington. I think this reduction ought to be made, and that it should be put in on the other branch of the work. It does not increase the appropriation in any way. I think you will agree with my amendment if you will give it serious consideration.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLANE. Is it not a fact that when they have these hearings in Washington and some Commissioner hears them they then refer the matter to the Commission, and the Commissioner could go down into the field and it would save the taxpayers thousands of dollars of money if they would send them down there instead of letting "Mohamet come to the mountain."

Mr. MAY. That is true; but it would be infinitely more economical and cheap for the people who are concerned in the hearings that the Commissioner or examiner go down there instead of bringing 40 people to the city of Washington as witnesses in every case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I am not out of sympathy with the purpose that my colleague from Kentucky has in mind. I think the gentleman is not exactly accurate in the conclusion that he draws from the appropriation which the committee has recommended. The amendment offered by the gentleman, on page 23, line 24, reduces that appropriation \$500,000. The gentleman gives notice that if that amendment is adopted he will move to increase the appropriation later on in the bill.

Now, it is true that in the bill it says \$2,155,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia. May I call my friend's attention to the fact that while these are employees of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the main office in the District of Columbia, yet from this force come the people who go out into the field and conduct the hearings which my friend says he wishes continued rather than have the hearings held in Washington. If we take the \$500,000 away, we simply further reduce the field activities of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman from Virginia does not understand my point. The purpose I have in mind is to save the people of the country who have cases before the Commission the expense of having to gather here in Washington, pay hotel bills and railroad fares, and the expense of bringing witnesses here, when an examiner can be sent in the field.

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes; I think I understand the gentleman's point of view, but this amendment takes money out of the bill in such a way as to force them to cut down these hearings in the field.

Mr. MAY. The effect already has been that they have ordered 15 big cases to Washington.

Mr. WOODRUM. I may say to my friend from Kentucky that it is an old custom among bureaus and commissions of the Government that whenever you take 5 cents away from them they will begin to holler that you have curtailed the particular activity they know Members of Congress and their constituents are going to be interested in. For instance, if you curtail appropriations for the Agricultural Department, they immediately say that next year they will not be able to publish the Agricultural Yearbook, feeling that some of us Congressmen who want the yearbook will have an amendment put in the bill putting it back.

So it is also when we come to the Interstate Commerce Commission. We have cut them pretty deep, I will admit, but no deeper than we have cut everybody, including our soldiers, ourselves, and our employees.

When we cut them they said, "We will not be able to have as many hearings in the field as we have had before." Our committee feels that perhaps it will not be necessary to have

as many hearings in the field. But, Mr. Chairman, if experience shows it is necessary to have these hearings and they do not have sufficient funds to conduct the necessary hearings in the field, this committee and the Congress will be willing to give it to them. However, we want to put them on starvation rations for a little while, as we are doing with every activity of the Government, and see how it works out by the time we come here next year.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman care to refer to page 105 of the hearings where he himself examined one of the witnesses and where the witness, McManamy, answered a question by Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] asked this question:

After July 1 you are not going to set any of these cases?

That is referring to a large number that he testified about on the previous page and on that page.

Mr. McManamy answered:

No; these are the cases that we had to call to Washington. During the next fiscal year there will be a great many more.

In other words, he states there—and it is not contradicted—that they are going to bring the United States to Washington regardless of the expense to the litigants.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the gentleman that it is true the Interstate Commerce Commission complained about this cut, as I have stated. They undertook to base their claim for a more liberal appropriation upon the fact they had to have these hearings. But our committee feels that we have not cut them unreasonably. We do not believe the right of any constituent is going to be interfered with by this cut we have made. If it is, then we are ready to come back and recommend an additional appropriation when the time comes.

Mr. MAY. Why not take care of it now?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. I notice in the hearings that the committee, as far as I can understand, did not agree that the cut would cause all of these hearings to be held in Washington of necessity. That is merely the testimony of one of the Commissioners.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is right.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. As I understand it, the committee does not feel it will be necessary to bring all these cases to Washington. Is that right?

Mr. WOODRUM. The committee felt that the Interstate Commerce Commission, if it tries to cooperate with the committee and with Congress in our economy efforts, will be able to conduct their hearings in the field, although they may possibly have to bring some of the cases to Washington.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Virginia be extended 2 minutes, that he may answer another question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman from Virginia understands, no doubt, that the President is prepared now and will soon send to Congress during this session—and it will be enacted into law—a proposed merger of all the railroads; and the message announced that the bill will be so drawn that the railroads may coordinate, consolidate, and eliminate branches.

Suppose this bill goes through and operations under it are started. Suppose it is proposed to discontinue a 50-mile railroad somewhere in the country. Can the Commission, without going to the place or having somebody down there view the premises and take the hearings, get the right picture of the situation? Can this be done by having the people come here to Washington?

Mr. WOODRUM. I think the gentleman need not be uneasy about the Commission not being supplied with funds

necessary to take care of any new activity the administration puts on it.

This is the appropriation the Director of the Budget sent to Congress and the President himself said it would be sufficient to run the Interstate Commerce Commission. The committee did not cut it any. We have given just what the Director of the Budget and the President of the United States said it was right for the Interstate Commerce Commission to have.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I wonder how much investigation of the facts and figures in connection with this matter the President has had the time to make since March 4.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. This item of \$2,250,000 is the amount that is used for the field-service work. If the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] should be agreed to, then we would have less field work done and more centralization here in the city of Washington.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is exactly the point I tried to make.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that the total reduction here under the 1933 appropriation is less than 15 percent?

Mr. WOODRUM. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. And is it not also a fact that the reduction in some of the items is more than 15 percent?

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. McFARLANE. I notice on page 104 of the hearings that Mr. McManamy states that this item of appropriation is \$2,692,000, which has been cut, as shown by the bill, to \$2,250,000, or \$442,000. I wish the gentleman would tell us how many men they have available for this field work to go out and hold these hearings, and if the gentleman knows, also tell us how much it is going to cost the people concerned to come to Washington to attend these hearings. In other words, let us see how much we are going to save the taxpayers of this country by forcing all the people in the country who are interested in these matters to come here to attend the hearings, when we could send a Commissioner or an examiner which would only be one railroad fare, whereas under the other plan, we are causing thousands of people to come to Washington just to accommodate some little commissioner who does not want to leave the footlights of the capital.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman has made a speech and I really do not know what his question is.

Mr. McFARLANE. The question is whether or not you are cutting the bill \$442,000—

Mr. WOODRUM. That does not all come out of this item. A good portion of that is the regular salary reduction and the rest is the percentage cut that we are giving all these departments to compel them to economize in this period of emergency. When we have had to cut our veterans by reason of the present emergency, we are also going to cut the departments and make them economize.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The appropriation for 1933 for this service was \$2,600,000. This was some reduction under the previous appropriation, but not very much. They tell us that under this appropriation they are having difficulty in going out into the field

and holding these hearings. I believe that this is just a bureaucratic idea that they should not work the way they ought to work in the interest of the people.

It is from this appropriation that money is provided to go out in the field and take the testimony there. If we cut this appropriation they will have less money to work on in the field.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Then why do you confine it to being expended in the District of Columbia, if you want them to go out in the field?

Mr. TABER. This is for the employees who are based here in the District.

Mr. MAY. Then you are going to spend \$2,155,000 on employees in the District of Columbia?

Mr. TABER. These employees are the ones who go out in the field. They are stationed here, but they are sent out in the field to hold these hearings. The employees who hold the hearings are not stationed in the field but are stationed here in Washington.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. McFARLANE. If the gentleman will refer to line 1, page 24, of the bill, it is shown there that this appropriation may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia. Why should we not provide that it may be expended Nation-wide, so we would have an opportunity to send these commissioners out in the field? If you are going to spend this money in the District of Columbia, that limits it to the District alone.

Mr. TABER. They can spend this money to go out in the field the way the language is now, and they have never had any trouble with the Comptroller's Office in doing this. The item to which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] refers, and to which he proposes to add certain money, is \$1,000,000 for the Valuation Division. This \$1,000,000, it was stated to us by the Commissioner who has charge of this work, Mr. Lewis, will be sufficient for them to do everything that is required to be done, with the recapture provision out, without the least bit of trouble, and they probably in the future may be able to get along with less. It does not seem to me we ought to cut down the work of sending these people out by cutting this appropriation, but we should really allow the cut of about 15 percent to stand—it is not quite 15 percent, because we are \$40,000 above a 15 percent cut in this appropriation—but I believe we should see if they cannot do all of the work with this appropriation, and I believe they can if they have the proper amount of ginger.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. What I should like to know is whether the language of this provision is any different from what has been carried in the previous appropriation bills.

Mr. TABER. It is exactly the same language, and the Comptroller has ruled that this is sufficient to permit them to operate.

Mr. HOPE. And they have been holding these hearings in the field under the authority of previous bills, which contained the same language.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall probably not consume all the 5 minutes, but I do want to call the attention of the committee to the technicalities and the unworkability of the Interstate Commerce Commission's rules and regulations.

It is almost as difficult to present your case to the Interstate Commerce Commission as it is to the Supreme Court of the United States. Entirely too much delay and red tape.

The melon growers in my district planted a rather large acreage this year, contemplating that they would enjoy the same freight rates they had been enjoying for the past few seasons. But the Interstate Commerce Commission, in the face of the panic and the business collapse, has permitted the freight rates to be increased from \$10 to \$50 per car. It seems to me utterly inconsistent and absurd for the Interstate Commerce Commission to have found that the melon growers should now pay from \$10 to \$50 more per car to get their melons to the market, especially when our growers are hardly breaking even. In fact, many of them have lost money during the past few seasons. From my district they now pay about \$200 per car to New York and eastern markets; some \$250 to \$300 per car to Michigan. The railroads get this transportation charge because a guaranty is required before the melons are moved from shipping point. Sometimes the melons fail to bring even the freight charges. Often nothing at all is left for the grower. This is also very often the case with our shippers of other vegetables and fruits. Why does not the Interstate Commerce Commission see that they have the same rates accorded the steel and other highly financed monopolies? Why the vast difference in these rates?

The Congress has created bureau after bureau and commission after commission undertaking to help our constituents, the plain, everyday people of America, only to find that in the due course of time the commissions are in many instances devoured by the special interests and monopolies and trusts.

I think, instead of the amendment of my friend from Kentucky, we may do more good toward the American people if we would indiscriminately abolish and scrap and junk practically all of the so-called "service commissions" and "bureaus" and then vigorously enforce our antitrust laws through the Department of Justice. [Applause.]

Why should the Interstate Commerce Commission advise me to have my people present a petition and proceed in some set, cut-and-dried, and drawn-out manner? If we did that, we probably could not get before the Commission before the melon season was over. O, Mr. Chairman, why have these commissions so far forgotten the needs of our people?

Why do not they send a Commissioner or an inspector down to Florida, and in 5 days he could make a report on the melon rates as to whether they should be reduced to the same as we enjoyed last season. Our growers contemplated the lower rate when they planted this crop. Now, when it is about ready to ship, the rates are liberally raised. Is this fair?

The red tape of the bureaus—the Commission—is so wound around by complicated rules that you cannot get any action out of them. Why should not the Commission suspend the enforcement of these rates? They have made their own rules and hide behind them.

I doubt if we should appropriate the huge amount here asked for. I am inclined to think that my friend's amendment should be adopted until we can get some reaction, some cooperation, and some service from some of the bureaus and commissions to which we are paying high salaries, allowances, and traveling expenses to help raise the freight rate of my constituents.

It may be that I am a little radical on these things, but somehow I cannot help it when I see these abuses, long delays, evasions, buck passing, and a general lack of interest for the down-and-out American citizens, the farmers in particular, because if anyone is now hard hit it is our farmers. They have been sandbagged and robbed, literally speaking, until they have nothing left. It is a shame.

I submit one or two of the telegrams recently received and the reply of the Interstate Commerce Commission, as follows:

Hon. R. A. GREEN,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed you will find a petition submitted by watermelon growers of Suwannee County for your consideration. This petition is self-explanatory.

The grievance is that with the low prices received by growers for melons for the past 3 years that freight rates are so high that they are prohibitive. For example, a grower in Live Oak, Fla., shipping melons to New York has to guarantee the freight under bond before the railroad company will move the car, and the freight is more than \$200 per car. The net returns to farmer for last season was about \$35 per car. Thus, the railroad gets practically all and the farmer nothing.

This condition is causing farmers to seek truck conveyance into large cities, and the railroads are going to suffer.

This appeal is in no way to ask unjust cuts in rates on melons, but merely to request a fair rate so that our growers can continue to grow melons. If something is not done to relieve this situation, the melon growers of this State will be forced to discontinue growing melons.

Correspondence regarding this petition should be directed to Mr. J. A. DeBerry, Live Oak, Fla., sending copy to me.

Thanking you for consideration of above, I am,

Yours truly,

N. G. THOMAS, County Agent.

TRENTON, FLA., April 27, 1933.

Hon. R. A. GREEN,  
United States Congressman, Washington, D.C.:

The advance tariff on watermelons affecting present growing crop Florida and Georgia from ten to more than fifty dollars per car will cause growers lose money and eventually force them to quit growing this commodity for market. Imperative this advance taken off, restoring old rates. Please use your best efforts.

S. G. GAY.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, May 2, 1933.

Hon. R. A. GREEN,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. GREEN: Please be referred to your letter of the 26th ultimo, addressed to the chairman, concerning a telegram received from Mr. S. G. Gay, Trenton, Fla., with respect to increased freight rates on watermelons.

The rates involved are evidently those found justified by the Commission in its decision of February 18, 1933, in I. & S. Docket No. 3706, *Watermelons from, to, and between southern points* (191 I.C.C. No. 534).

This investigation came about through schedules filed to become effective February 23, 1932, wherein the carriers proposed to cancel commodity rates and establish in lieu thereof rates based, generally speaking, 30 percent of first class, in order to remove irregularities prohibited by the long-and-short-haul clause of the Interstate Commerce Act. Upon protest of the regulatory authorities of Georgia, Florida, and others, the rates were suspended for investigation to determine the propriety thereof.

Following hearing in this case the Commission found the proposed rates justified, with certain modifications. Those found justified were allowed to become effective March 22, 1933, and the modified rates were made effective May 1, 1933.

The adjustment was of widespread effect, involving both increases and reductions in existing rates, and such rates were permitted to become effective only after full hearing of parties interested.

In the event shippers consider it advisable and desire to attack any specific rate adjustment, their recourse lies in the filing of a formal complaint in accordance with the Commission's rules of practice.

Respectfully,

G. B. MCGINTY, Secretary.

MCINTOSH, FLA., May 9, 1933.

Hon. CONGRESSMAN R. A. GREEN,  
Washington, D.C.:

Right on verge beginning shipments watermelons from Florida and Georgia, railroads have, in our opinion, unjustly advanced rates this commodity, which is one of their foremost agricultural products. Advancing rates at this time certainly no cooperation with farmers and is duly unjust. L. E. Holloway, president Melon Distributors Association, wired President Roosevelt protesting against this unjust advance. We urge you to lend your supreme effort handling Interstate Commerce Commission to place these rates back same basis as last year, remembering all shipments watermelons require bond guaranteeing freight.

CHRISTIAN & NEAL,

By J. B. NEAL,

Secretary and Treasurer, Marion County,  
Democratic Committeeman.

TRENTON, FLA., May 4, 1933.

Hon. R. A. GREEN,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Immediate action necessary. Please urge Interstate Commerce Commission reestablish former freight rates watermelons from

southeastern territory. Recent published rates absolutely prohibitive, will bankrupt growers, as old rates were already too high. Many cars selling below charges. Please use influence; get emergency action, thereby saving important industry.

D. H. BROWNING,  
M. L. LANGFORD,  
A. F. RUTLEDGE.

I joined in these protests and urged that they be given consideration. These new rates should be suspended until at least the present crop could be harvested, then let our growers be advised in advance as to future increases, then probably fewer would try to grow melons.

The following communication has just been received from the Commission:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,  
Washington, May 10, 1933.

Hon. R. A. GREEN,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have your favor of 8th instant, with which you enclosed a communication dated 6th instant and addressed to you by Mr. R. H. Pennington, secretary of the Melon Distributors Association, Evansville, Ind., and telegram dated 4th instant and addressed to you by Messrs. D. H. Browning, M. L. Langford, and A. F. Rutledge, of Trenton, Fla., relating to rates for the transportation of watermelons from points in southeastern territory.

Upon inquiry I learn that the rates referred to became effective on the 1st day of this month, and that they are supposed to be in harmony with a decision of division 3 of the Commission, rendered on February 18, 1933, in *Watermelons from, to, and between southern points* (191 I.C.C. 435). As a practical matter, therefore, the rates cannot be interfered with by the Commission except after the hearing provided for in section 15 pursuant to a complaint filed in accordance with the provisions of section 13 of the Interstate Commerce Act. Under the provisions of the act carriers are free to initiate rates and cannot be required by the Commission to change them after they have become effective unless and until the hearing mentioned has been held, and then only for the purpose of making effective one or more of the provisions of the act.

Many telegrams and other communications similar to those of your correspondents have reached the Commission recently, but because of the restrictions above set forth you will readily understand why it is impossible for the Commission to take such quick action concerning rates of transportation as interested parties appear to desire.

Very respectfully,

P. J. FARRELL, Chairman.

Now, may I ask my colleagues why the Congress should maintain bureaus and commissions? I await an answer. If the Commission is not at fault and new legislation is needed, I call on our administration and leaders to offer such remedial legislation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky to strike out \$500,000 from the bill, and then I am going to vote against the next amendment to put it back in, as he wants to do.

I congratulate the committee in having cut out more than \$2,000,000 of this appropriation bill, and it is carrying now twice as much as it ought to carry.

I want to say to you that, in my opinion, the condition that the railroads are in today is by reason of the fact that we have given the Interstate Commerce Commission the right to fix the rates for them on every article of commerce that is shipped in interstate commerce. They have been the means of pauperizing the railroads. If you will take off the orders by which the railroads are tied today, with the restrictions put upon them, whereby they cannot reduce their rates, then the railroads will come out without trouble. They are now penalized if they undertake to reduce the rate fixed by this Interstate Commerce Commission anywhere in the United States, and that is what is the matter. This Commission is running around and investigating the disobedience of some little order of the Commission. I have introduced a bill in this Congress—and have introduced it before—to provide that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall fix only the highest rates that could be charged by the railroads and express companies for carrying freight, and thus leave the railroads open for competition with each other, so that they could make some of these reductions in freight rates. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] a moment ago stated the freight rates with respect to fruit in his State, and

I can point back to the day when this same Commission destroyed one of the most profitable businesses in my State.

We were shipping thousands of crates of cantaloupes, carloads of them, throughout the entire United States. As soon as the Interstate Commerce Commission got to the point where it could fix a rate it put those men out of business. I should be glad today, as an experiment at least, to absolutely abolish this Commission and the Federal Trade Commission, which was discussed a moment ago, which carries \$900,000. It has accomplished no good whatever, in my opinion. I believe that if you will continue to reduce the appropriations for these Commissions every year we will finally know whether or not they ought to be continued; I think it will be disclosed then that these Commissions are some of the greatest detriments that we have to trouble us now. We are living under an administration of bureaus and commissions, under a commission government, under a bureaucratic government. When the Attorney General wants to find out what the law is on some point, he has to hunt some little bureau to find out what kind of an order it has made by reason of the power given to it by Congress. I am tired of that kind of government. I want to see this Congress legislate, pass laws, fix a rate that is right, and let it be enforced by the court, and do away with the bureaucratic government now existing in this country. As one gentleman said, do away with the red tape. Let us turn the railroads loose to compete with each other and we will have better times in this country and they will prosper.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Does the gentleman know of any good reason why we need 11 of these high-powered Commissioners to do the work of the Interstate Commerce Commission? Could it not be done just as well by 3 or 5?

Mr. GLOVER. Three would do just as well as 11.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLOVER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. It costs \$250 to \$300 per car to ship our watermelons to the State of Michigan.

Mr. GLOVER. I was down in my State a year or so ago and they were shipping out a carload of cabbages and the man shipping it said that he sold the carload in the market, and that he was paying almost as much to get it to market as he got for the whole carload.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a division. Several Members desire to have the amendment read. I ask unanimous consent that before the vote is taken on the division the amendment be again reported by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment of Mr. MAY as follows:

Page 23, line 24, strike out "\$2,250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,750,000."

The Committee again divided; and there were—ayes 29, noes 45.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Regulating accounts: To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to enforce compliance with section 20 and other sections of the act to regulate commerce as amended by the act approved June 29, 1906 (U.S.C., title 49, sec. 20), and as amended by the Transportation Act, 1920 (U.S.C., title 49, sec. 20), including the employment of necessary special accounting agents or examiners, and traveling expenses, \$750,000, of which amount not to exceed \$172,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That for the portion of the fiscal year 1933 remaining after the date of enactment of this act the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia from the 1933 appropriation for the purposes included in this paragraph shall be at the annual rate of \$175,000.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McFARLANE: Page 24, line 25, after the figures at the end of the line, insert a colon and the words

"*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to hold hearings in the District of Columbia."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to this section. This section is the section providing for the personnel for the accounting division in the District of Columbia. It is not a section relating to the holding of hearings.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, then I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be made to apply to line 10. While I was preparing the amendment the Clerk read on down the page. I want this amendment to apply to the first section.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I would have to make the point of order to that.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I think it is good where it is, and I want to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything in this paragraph that provides an appropriation for the holding of hearings?

Mr. WOODRUM. No. The information of the committee is that the appropriation which provided for the hearings, to which the gentleman from Texas doubtless refers, is an appropriation carried in the first paragraph. That begins on line 23 and the appropriation was for \$2,250,000. We have passed that section.

Mr. McFARLANE. I call attention to the amendment and the section under which it is carried and the wording of the paragraph, which reads:

Including employment of necessary special accounting agents or examiners and traveling expenses, \$750,000, of which amount not to exceed \$172,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

That shows that traveling expenses are involved. It shows that special investigators, agents, and so forth, are involved in the amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is true, but by an examination of the organic law, section 20, it will be found that section 20 of the act to regulate commerce is the section providing for valuation accounts of the railroads and for the policing of those accounts.

Mr. McFARLANE. Does the gentleman have that section before him?

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not have it here, but I know what the organic law is.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the present existing law permits hearings in Washington. The amendment offered by the gentleman would change existing law.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, in answer to that, I should like to call attention to the fact that it is not legislation attached to an appropriation bill, but it is a limitation upon the appropriation itself, and I do not think the point of order raised by the gentleman from Texas is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Virginia, chairman of the subcommittee, advise the Chair what he has in mind when he uses the word "policing"?

Mr. WOODRUM. I can answer the Chair better by referring to page 315 of the hearings on the original bill in the last session of Congress:

Functions of Bureau of Accounts: (1) to prescribe and revise uniform systems of accounts for all classes of carriers under our jurisdiction;

(2) To enforce these systems of accounts by test examinations; and

(3) To make such special accounting examinations as our duties may require—

And so forth.

It does not refer at all to rate cases, in which hearings the gentleman is interested. That appropriation is carried in the section of the bill which we have just debated, and to which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] offered an amendment which failed. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas is not germane to this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McCLINTIC). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair thinks that the amendment as offered is not germane to this paragraph.

The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be offered at the end of line

10 on page 24, and I ask unanimous consent to return to that portion of the bill.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Reserving the right to object, I shall not object to offering the amendment, but I certainly shall object to any further debate.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, in view of the action of the House in just voting on this amendment, I am compelled to object. I do not want to be discourteous to my good friend from Texas, but I shall be forced to object to the unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Valuation of property of carriers: To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to carry out the objects of the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce', approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof", by providing for a valuation of the several classes of property of carriers subject thereto and securing information concerning their stocks, bonds, and other securities, approved March 1, 1913 (U.S.C., title 49, sec. 19a), including 1 director of valuation at \$10,000 per annum, 1 supervisor of land appraisals, 1 supervising engineer, 1 supervisor of accounts, and 1 principal valuation examiner, at \$9,000 each per annum, and traveling expenses, \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia if suitable space is provided by the Public Buildings Commission.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 27, line 16, after the word "expenses", strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,500,000."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, it is somewhat discouraging, in the face of the previous action of the House when I undertook to reduce an appropriation, to now undertake to increase one; but a mere reading of this subsection of the bill will convince any of you who will just think about it a while that this appropriation is entirely too small for the purpose.

Under this provision of the bill, the valuation department of the Commission, which includes the valuation of all property of the carriers, is required not only to view and inspect 400,000 miles of railroad in the United States, 250,000 of which is trunk line, but they must go into an investigation, under the provisions of this bill, that will secure information concerning stocks and bonds and other securities held by the railroads. It is not only an appraisal and valuation department as to lands and physical properties but it includes all securities. Most of those securities are now in the hands of the United States Government, or rather its agent, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. When we pass new legislation that we will all vote for, perhaps, under the lash of the whip, as we have been in the habit of doing, you will find there is going to be an overhauling and housecleaning of the railroads of this country from one end to the other, not only of the main lines but the branch lines, and there will be a discontinuance of lines and railroad and transportation facilities; and the branch of the Commission that has charge of the valuation department will be compelled to revalue all those properties. That is just what the railroads want to do. They want to cripple that valuation department so that they cannot get a fair valuation, and then they can dicker with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Treasury Department with the Government blind and its hands tied. I think this appropriation should be increased so that this branch of the activities will not be curtailed under the important and crucial position we are going to be in within the next few months with these changing conditions under the new deal we are going to have.

The importance of this appraisal department is emphasized over and over by past events one or two of which I shall point out here. In 1931 the Post Office Department was planning the building of 2 large and expensive public buildings in 2 of our great cities, New York and Chicago. At New York the lowest price they were offered on the site at Grand Central Station was \$14,500,000, and somebody with foresight enough to think of it asked the land depart-

ment of the Interstate Commerce Commission for their valuation which was furnished very promptly and which resulted in a finding that the proper value of that particular property was not \$14,500,000, the authorized contract price, but \$7,000,000; and by reason of the efficiency of this department the Government made an actual net saving of \$7,500,000, which is one and one half times the amount of money contained in this bill for the entire Commission. Quite a nice little saving for one case. The same thing occurred in Chicago where the saving was no mean sum but a handsome little bagatelle of \$5,000,000, almost the amount of this entire appropriation, and yet some wise men in the name of economy would materially cripple if not destroy this valuable activity. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Bureau of Valuations of the Interstate Commerce Commission is that part of the activity which has to do largely with making the primary valuation and keeping the valuation up-to-date on properties of the common carriers.

Congress is just about in the act, I think, of repealing section 15a of the Transportation Act which calls for the recapture of excess earnings of railroads, which is a ludicrous phrase in this day and time, because "There ain't any such animal" now as excess earnings of railroads.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. MAY. It means to give back to the railroads about \$360,000,000 that is charged up to them, about \$10,000,000 of which is in the Treasury.

Mr. WOODRUM. No; it does not mean that because we have been able to get only a small portion of that into our hands, two or three millions of dollars in real cash.

Mr. MAY. But this amount today is due under the recapture clause.

Mr. WOODRUM. Oh, there is a lot of it due, but how are the railroads ever going to be able to pay the Government what they owe it under the recapture clause? They will have to borrow money from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to pay back to the Government money they owe under the recapture clause of the Interstate Commerce Commission Act for the Government to pay back to the railroads, an utterly paradoxical and incongruous situation.

Mr. MAY. In other words the Government has played the part of Santa Claus until it proposes to change the Valuation Act and let the railroads say what they think they are worth.

Mr. WOODRUM. No more absolutely unjustifiable provision was ever written into a transportation act than that which in effect said to the railroads that when times were good and they were prosperous they would be limited to a certain percentage of earnings, yet when times get bad the railroads must look out for themselves, although every other man in business individually or every other concern is enabled under the law to lay up a little something against a rainy day.

Some of the railroads by careful economy and good management in prosperous times were able to make money, yet the Government undertakes to take it away from them and not guarantee them against loss when conditions fall off.

Even with the reduction the appropriation for this purpose is still \$1,000,000, which is quite a considerable sum. It leaves them a skeleton organization with which to carry on until Congress and the President finally decide what the national policy is going to be with reference to railroads.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question? I dislike to interrupt the gentleman, for he is so courteous in his general demeanor to all of us, but does the gentleman think it is exactly fair to give back to the railroads by new legislation \$360,000,000 that we could compel them to pay and at the same time take away from the veterans of the World War \$560,000,000, and then say that we will not keep in touch with and keep our hands on these railroads, which we guarantee may earn 6 percent?

Mr. WOODRUM. If my friend from Kentucky has kept abreast of the situation with reference to this recapture of

excess earnings, as I am sure he has, he will know that the Government is faced with litigation from now until the crack of doom before it can ever collect these excess earnings. With the exception of one or two railroads, none of them would be financially able to pay any of it. If we had valid judgments against them today, they could not be collected.

On the other hand, speaking of our veterans, if we rehabilitate the railroads, if we put them back to work, if we start them running their railroad engines and rolling stock, calling back into service their engineers and brakemen, putting into service their passenger-carrying facilities, then the veterans over this country will have some opportunity to get a job, some place where they can hope to get one. The one thing they want above all else in the world from the Federal Government is a fair, square chance to have what every American citizen ought to have, an opportunity to work and earn a living.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not a fact that if the Government did recover from the few railroads that have made excess earnings that the money would not go into the Treasury but the great bulk of it would go to railroads that have not earned the interest on their capital investment?

Mr. WOODRUM. I thank the gentleman for that suggestion. I may remind the gentleman from Kentucky that if we collected all the \$360,000,000 today, not one red copper penny of it would go back into the pockets of the people who paid them. The excess earnings go into a revolving fund to make up the deficits of mismanaged railroads.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Has the chairman of the committee made any investigation of this subject to know how many presidents and vice presidents of these mismanaged railroads are receiving salaries in excess of \$100,000 a year?

Mr. WOODRUM. Oh, a great many, too many, are receiving high salaries, I may say to the gentleman from Kentucky.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Not to exceed \$2,500 of the appropriations herein made for the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be available for expenses, except membership fees, for attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Commission.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McFARLANE: Page 28, between lines 7 and 8, after the word "Commission", insert a new section, to read as follows:

"Not to exceed \$200,000 for traveling expenses, reporting service, and other expenses incurred in the holding of hearings outside the District of Columbia."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that, in the first place, it is not germane to the portion of the bill to which it is offered; and, in the second place, it changes existing law. Existing law authorizes the holding of hearings in the District of Columbia, and the amendment seeks to change this.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman's point of order, I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that this is offered at the close of the Interstate Commerce Commission section of the independent offices appropriation bill, and that the item for general administrative expense carries an appropriation of a certain sum which shall be expended within the District of Columbia, and according to the hearings, on page 107, it has been brought out that—

For the fiscal year 1932 the reporting expense was \$100,000 and the travel expense was \$116,000, practically all of which was for

field hearings. The official reporting expense this year, up to and including March 31, has been \$61,000, in round numbers, and the traveling expense has been \$40,000.

This is not a change in existing law and it is not legislation on an appropriation bill. It is a provision such as the paragraph above, and if a point of order is good to this section it is good to the one above, because it is worded in the same language—not to exceed a certain sum shall be expended in a certain way for certain expenses which have been permissible under the law all along or up until the appropriation was cut out at this session.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McClintic). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment in the nature of a new paragraph, which reads:

Not to exceed \$200,000 for traveling expenses, reporting service, and other expenses incurred in the holding of hearings outside the District of Columbia.

In view of the fact that the first paragraph of this title deals with this subject, the Chair thinks it is not germane to the portion of the bill to which it is now offered, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is not my purpose to go into detail regarding the method being pursued by the Appropriations Committee to continue the Democratic gag-rule system, nor to enter into extended arguments regarding items contained in the independent offices bill.

I gladly voted for the Roosevelt economy bill, and I am in accord and sympathy with the President's efforts to bring about marked economies in governmental expenditures. This is a much better way to aid in balancing the Budget than continuously suggesting, as the Democratic majority is doing, new forms of expenditures and camouflaging them under the cloak of bond issues.

There is, however, one item of economy in the pending bill which I think goes too far. It appears on page 44, where the amount provided for carrying on the work of the Veterans' Administration for the next fiscal year is fixed at \$77,273,000. It seems to be understood that this reduced figure involves the abolition of the regional offices of the Bureau. While all savings are desirable, it is my opinion that the doing away of the regional offices will bring about unintentional and severe hardships. My district covers the western part of Massachusetts. A year or so ago it was reported that the Springfield branch of the Bureau, which contacted veterans in that section and handled their preliminary physical examinations and other matters, was to be closed. This caused almost an uprising among the veterans in the western part of the State. Their protest was so great that it was finally decided to continue the Springfield station. The presence of this station made it unnecessary for veterans living west of the Connecticut River to make the long journey to Boston. On May 1, however, the Springfield branch was closed, and now it is proposed to also close the regional office in Boston.

This will leave the veterans without any opportunity for personal contact with officials who must pass upon their claims and will require them to present all matters in writing. Such a procedure will impose an undue handicap on many veterans. The majority of them are not expert letter writers. Many of them have not the education and training necessary for the proper presentation of their claims in writing. To deprive these veterans of the opportunity of personal contact with physicians and other representatives of the Veterans' Administration is, in my opinion, an extreme injustice.

It will be difficult enough for the Administration to convince veterans that the recent reductions in their compensa-

tion are fair and just; but to withdraw from veterans their opportunity to present their cases verbally to persons with sympathetic ears and understanding is something they will not understand. No amount of formal routine correspondence from the Bureau here will take the place of this personal contact.

My relations with the Boston regional office have been highly satisfactory. I consider that Colonel Blake is certainly an outstanding official and that his office has been conducted most efficiently. I sincerely hope that for the sake of the veterans of Massachusetts that office will not be discontinued.

The department commander of Massachusetts, the American Legion, is in Washington and has interviewed the members of the Massachusetts delegation. Commander Rose has stressed the desirability of maintaining the Boston office. I quote from his statement, as follows:

Nor is it necessary for us to bring to the attention of Massachusetts Members the humane side of this question. The Federal Government is about to stop the compensation and allowances of thousands of veterans. Practically all of those will seek some explanation of their removal from the lists. If this explanation is given them personally by a sympathetic attaché of the Veterans' Bureau, the blow will not fall quite so hard. But if the veteran is told that he cannot even get a hearing, that his court of appeal has been abolished, our elected officials are breeding distrust, if not outright hate, for the Government in whose defense he once offered his life.

The amount which would be saved by abolishing the regional offices is not sufficiently large to upset the economy program. On the other hand, the benefits to be derived from the continuation of these offices, from a humanitarian standpoint, as well as the mental attitude of the veterans, are fully sufficient to warrant the expense involved.

It is noted from this morning's press that the President's advisers have seen the handwriting on the wall and have made what appears to be a formal announcement that not all regional offices will be abolished. It is, of course, safe to assume that among the number retained will be the one at Boston, as the amount of business which has been transacted there would give that office a leading place on the list of those to be favorably considered. The veterans in the district which I represent naturally will receive this announcement with satisfaction.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, \$3,322,500.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to interrogate the chairman of the subcommittee. At the bottom of page 31 there is a provision for the "demolition of buildings." I desire to ask the chairman whether any money carried by this appropriation can be used to wreck and destroy the present Post Office Department Building?

Mr. WOODRUM. It is the understanding of the committee that this does not include any funds for that purpose.

Mr. LOZIER. I thank the gentleman for this assurance. For several years under the Hoover administration repeated and persistent efforts were made to have Congress appropriate money to tear down the Post Office Department Building. On several occasions I have joined my colleagues in defeating appropriations of funds to destroy this perfectly good public building that is built of Maine granite and, if not deliberately demolished, will stand for a thousand years. It is one of the best and most substantial buildings in Washington. But under the Coolidge-Hoover administration those who had charge of the public-building program ruthlessly sought to destroy every public building that did not conform to the classic Greek type of architecture. They also marked the Southern Building and the District Building for destruction. They proposed to spend several million dollars reconstructing the War, Navy, and State Department Building. I am proud of the fact that I have had a part in defeating these proposals several times. So long as I am a Member of this House I will continue to oppose the wanton destruction of these splendid buildings. To wreck the Post Office Department Building, the Southern Building, and the

District Building and to remodel the State and War Building would be an act of vandalism and indefensible extravagance.

The Clerk read as follows:

American ethnology: For continuing ethnological researches among the American Indians and the natives of Hawaii, the excavation and preservation of archaeological remains under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution, including necessary employees, the preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations, the purchase of books and periodicals, and traveling expenses, \$50,000.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McFARLANE: Page 33, line 18, strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$25,000."

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, in this paragraph we are appropriating \$50,000 for continuing ethnological researches among the American Indians and the natives of Hawaii.

This would make a fine junketing trip this summer for the bone hunters over here in the Smithsonian Institution and allow them to go over the country looking up skeletons and old bones while people Nation-wide are starving. I think we can well afford to at least cut this appropriation half in two and save that much money.

I do not care to make any extended remarks on the subject. This ought to appeal to your sense of fairness, and it seems to me this appropriation ought to be at least cut in two. I think for at least another year we can give these bone hunters a vacation.

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. Does the gentleman have any facts he can give us to show that they can do this work on \$25,000?

Mr. McFARLANE. I have this information, I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky. If we can save this \$25,000, we can at least have that much money in the Treasury of the United States to feed some of the starving people in this country.

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. Does the gentleman have any information that would lead him to believe or lead the House to believe that the remaining \$25,000 would be of any benefit at all?

Mr. McFARLANE. If it is not, the money will remain in the Treasury, and we will not be out that amount of money. We ought to save all of this money, I will say very frankly to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. Then why did not the gentleman offer an amendment to that effect?

Mr. McFARLANE. I shall be pleased to accept such a substitute, striking out the full amount.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, the work of the Bureau of American Ethnology, according to the hearings, will be limited, under this appropriation, to the preservation and study of information already gathered concerning the American Indians and will not include field work or the initiation of new research work.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. McFARLANE. It says here in the bill that you are going over to Hawaii and see the girls dance. [Laughter.]

Mr. WOODRUM. I am assuming that the gentleman is speaking facetiously. I want to say seriously that the appropriation has been cut from \$61,000 to \$50,000. The Bureau of the Budget went into the matter thoroughly with the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian and cut every item to the bone, and then some. It does not call for any new work in the field or any new exploration. I see my good friend from Oklahoma is on his feet, and I remember that when the bill was up before he tried to cut the appropriation, but failed. I hope he is not going to object to this small amount.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I move that we strike out the last word. The chairman is correct; I did offer such an amendment when the bill was under consideration before. I will say that I have visited the National Museum

and I found the cellar and garret was filled with many kinds of various ancient objects, and I understand that the Smithsonian has also a large collection that the archeologists have brought to Washington. In view of the fact that we have more than can be housed properly at the present time, it would seem to me wise to postpone the further collection of such objects until conditions would warrant.

Mr. PARKER of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Yes.

Mr. PARKER of Georgia. Is this the same excavating and exploration party that the gentleman said last year could be done by one man?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I do not remember saying that, but I did say that I had witnessed some of these archeologists when exploring the western part of the United States during the summer time. Apparently they were having a delightful vacation, and when the winter or cooler months came they returned to Washington and spent the winter in preparing their reports.

It seems to me that when the Nation is in the red and nearly everyone is broke all such activities should be curtailed. I think that the amendment of the gentleman from Texas has merit. I regret exceedingly to take an opposite position to the chairman of the subcommittee, but I hope the House will adopt this amendment.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Yes.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Was any part of this exploration and expenditure made in the State of Oklahoma?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I do not know; but it makes no difference whether it is in Oklahoma or any other State.

Mr. O'MALLEY. The gentleman is not afraid that they might dig up something that ought not to be dug up?

Mr. McCLINTIC. If they did, it would not be comparable to what they might dig up in the gentleman's State. [Laughter.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending amendment. If this were a proposal to spend \$50,000 to advertise and sell wooden nutmegs in Hawaii, hooks and eyes in darkest Africa, automobiles in Europe, steel rails in Manchuria, no objection would probably be offered to the appropriation, because you would say that the appropriation and expenditure would help sell our manufactured products and promote trade and commerce. But here we have a proposal to expend a little money for cultural purposes; for ethnological researches among the American Indians and the natives of Hawaii; to excavate and preserve archeologic remains of prehistoric animals under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution; to preserve for posterity and civilization the remains of prehistoric animals and men.

Why should we not secure and preserve these ethnological specimens? If they can be discovered now and preserved, we shall have accomplished something worth while. Have we no appreciation of the past? Have we no desire to preserve the fossils that record the history of the genesis and evolution of plant life, animal life, and of the human species? Have the American people become so sordid and selfish that they are indifferent to culture and the preservation of these specimens of prehistoric ages when this old world was in a process of creation?

I believe it was Lord Macaulay who said that the English people could think only in terms of pounds, shillings, and pence; and I am wondering if the American people are becoming so sordid, self-centered, and cynical that they cannot think except in dollars and cents. Take the Library of Congress, one of the most marvelous and valuable possessions of the American people. Its millions of books preserve the culture, the wisdom, the literature, and the philosophy of all past ages. It is the greatest school of learning, the one all-important and outstanding university in the world. The value of this Library cannot be measured in

dollars and cents; yet many of us fail to avail ourselves of its treasures and deny ourselves the sources of information it offers.

The Smithsonian Institution, founded by an Englishman, has made a priceless contribution to the education and culture of the American people. It is preserving these priceless specimens of prehistoric ages for the oncoming generations. Some of us may not appreciate the treasures in the Smithsonian Institution and other national museums, but there are millions of people in the United States who do appreciate these mute yet eloquent records and legacies from prehistoric ages, and as the years come and go thousands of students will visit this institution, study its many thousand specimens which tell the history of the creation of the world, the origin and development of plant life, the evolution of animal life from the lowest conceivable order to the human species. The students and myriad millions in the near and distant future will rise up and call you blessed, because you gave your approval to this appropriation which but carried out the plan of our Government for more than a century to secure and preserve these mute memorials of the world's creation and of the development of animal and plant life. This little appropriation will increase the treasures of the Smithsonian Institution, and I hope you will vote down the amendment which seeks to withhold this fund. We cannot afford to be parsimonious in an educational and cultural matter like this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McFARLANE) there were—ayes 29, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of saying to the Members of the House that when the reading of the bill has been concluded and it has come into the House, I propose to offer a motion to recommit, to wipe from the bill section 6, authorizing the President to abolish contracts. That appears on page 52 of the bill. I shall do this because I believe that a proper case for this authority has not been made out, and I believe if it is carried into operation along the lines that have been presented here to the House in the arguments for it, it will result in great consequential damages being recovered against the United States, and not in a saving but in a large increase of expenditures.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, United States Shipping Board, \$310,000.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto be closed in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, I regret that I could not be on the floor of the House when the Federal Trade Commission item was being considered. In 1928 a Trade Practice Conference was held at Memphis, Tenn., under the auspices of the Federal Trade Commission in the interest of this great industry which operates largely in the South.

This Trade Practice Conference was presided over by a member of the Federal Trade Commission. Trade-practice rules and code of ethics for doing business on the part of this industry were worked out, adopted by the representatives from the various States representing the cottonseed-oil industry at the conference, and these rules were endorsed by the Federal Trade Commission. In less than 2 years complaints from the various cotton-growing States in the South were coming up to Members of Congress from farmers, cottonseed buyers, cotton ginner, and those gen-

erally interested in the producer of cotton as well as those who consumed the products of the cottonseed-oil industry.

Around the first of 1930 I made a thorough investigation of these complaints and found to my own entire satisfaction that the cottonseed-oil industry had taken advantage of these trade practice rules as endorsed by the Federal Trade Commission and had formulated a real monopolistic price-fixing combination.

At that time I charged that, under the operation of these trade-practice rules on the part of the cottonseed-oil industry, independent cottonseed buyers had been driven from the market, competition in buying cottonseed, on the part of cottonseed-oil mills, had been wiped out, and the farmers were being robbed of thousands of dollars annually under this monopolistic scheme. I further charged that the Southern Cotton Oil Co., the Buckeye Cotton Oil Mills owned by Procter & Gamble, refiners and manufacturers of various products, and the Swift Cotton Oil Mills owned by the Swift & Co., meat packers, had gone into a conspiracy to force cotton ginner and independent cotton mills to stay in line with their fixed prices.

These complaints as referred to were so strong, especially on the part of farmers, that a resolution was adopted in the Senate calling for an investigation of the cottonseed-oil industry by the Federal Trade Commission.

For the past 3 years the Federal Trade Commission has been making a thorough investigation. The testimony taken at the hearings in connection with this investigation at Washington and in the various States contained about 12 or 15 volumes. When I made these charges against the cottonseed-oil industry, Mr. B. F. Taylor, secretary to the South Carolina division of the National Cottonseed Products Association, who had charge of sending out all cottonseed prices in South Carolina, ramped all over me in a newspaper article in the Columbia State, denouncing my charges. I received a telegram from Mr. Taylor February 25, 1930, stating:

Your statement that there are no individual buyers of cottonseed in the South is without foundation. Your statement that there are no competitive prices on cottonseed is equally unfounded.

When one of our own Congressmen joins in the hue and cries in total disregard of his constituents' rights and of the facts, we think it high time he should be required to inform himself in the facts in the case instead of blindly following the leader and approving the statements of those who are wholly unacquainted with the conditions in the State and, we believe, in the South.

I am glad to state to the House that after 3 years patiently awaiting on the Federal Trade Commission to make a report as to its findings I am informed that my charges against this industry have been proven without a shadow of doubt.

I quote from information just received in regard to the result of this investigation on the part of the Federal Trade Commission:

I am pleased to inform you that the commission has in the last day of two thrown out the so-called "cottonseed rules", adopted at a trade-practice conference, bag and baggage, and ordered the chief counsel to institute a proceeding against the whole layout.

It appears from this that my good friend TAYLOR and many others that agreed with him apparently were not informed themselves or, if so, they were anxious to keep their information away from the public.

I am hoping that inasmuch as this report on the part of the Federal Trade Commission is coming at a time when we are serving under a Democratic administration that the Attorney General will take his gloves off and teach this industry a few things and let them know that the antitrust laws are still in full force, and that the great masses of people, individual producers and individual distributors, are entitled to free and open competition and a square deal at the hands of this industry.

The Clerk read as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION  
MILITARY SERVICES

Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services: For all salaries and expenses of the Veterans' Administration, including the expenses of maintenance and operation of medical, hospital, and domiciliary services of the Veterans' Administration, in

carrying out the duties, powers, and functions devolving upon it pursuant to the authority contained in the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to consolidate and coordinate governmental activities affecting war veterans", approved July 3, 1930 (U.S.C., supp. VI, title 38, secs. 11-11f), and any and all laws for which the Veterans' Administration is now or may hereafter be charged with administering, \$77,273,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,500 of this amount shall be available for expenses, except membership fees, of employees detailed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to attend meetings of associations for the promotion of medical science and annual national conventions of organized war veterans: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available also for personal services and rentals in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including traveling expenses; examination of estimates of appropriations in the field, including actual expenses of subsistence or per diem allowance in lieu thereof; for expenses incurred in packing, crating, drayage, and transportation of household effects and other property, not exceeding in any one case 5,000 pounds, of employees when transferred from one official station to another for permanent duty and when specifically authorized by the Administrator; furnishing and laundering of such wearing apparel as may be prescribed for employees in the performance of their official duties; purchase and exchange of law books, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; for passenger-carrying and other motor vehicles, including purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of same, including not more than two passenger automobiles for general administrative use of the Bureau in the District of Columbia and three for the Washington, D.C., regional office; and notwithstanding any provisions of law to the contrary, the Administrator is authorized to utilize Government-owned automotive equipment in transporting children of Veterans' Administration employees located at isolated stations to and from school under such limitations as he may by regulation prescribe; and notwithstanding any provisions of law to the contrary, the Administrator is authorized to procure actuarial services by contract, without obtaining competition, at such rates of compensation as he may determine to be reasonable; for operating expenses of the Arlington Building and annex, and the Wilkins Building, including repairs and mechanical equipment, fuel, electric current, ice, ash removal, and miscellaneous items; for allotment and transfer to the Public Health Service, the War, Navy, and Interior Departments, for disbursement by them under the various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration, including minor repairs and improvements of existing facilities under their jurisdiction necessary to such care and treatment; for expenses incidental to the maintenance and operation of farms; for recreational articles and facilities at institutions maintained by the Veterans' Administration; for administrative expenses incidental to securing employment for war veterans; for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto for beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration accruing during the fiscal year 1934 or prior fiscal years: *Provided further*, That the appropriations herein made for the care and maintenance of veterans in hospitals or homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration shall be available for the purchase of tobacco to be furnished, subject to such regulations as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall prescribe, to veterans receiving hospital treatment or domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration hospitals or homes: *Provided further*, That the appropriations herein made for domiciliary care shall be available for continuing aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled volunteer soldiers and sailors, in conformity with the act approved August 27, 1888 (U.S.C., title 24, sec. 134), as amended, including all classes of veterans admissible to the Veterans' Administration homes: *Provided further*, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may, with the concurrence of the Attorney General, transfer to the Department of Justice such personnel and/or funds as may be deemed necessary in connection with the defense of suits against the United States under section 19 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: Page 44, line 6, strike out the figures "77,273,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "85,273,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$8,000,000 of this amount shall be available for all expenses and maintenance of all regional offices of the Veterans' Administration."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, prepared and drafted by my distinguished friend from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] and myself, and which I am submitting for both of us, is probably one of the most important amendments that will be offered to this bill. I hope my friend from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] will permit liberal debate upon the amendment. I am sure there are many Members anxious to have their views on this amendment expressed, and for that reason I hope that ample time will be allowed so that Members on both sides of the aisle and of the question may have opportunity to express the same.

Mr. WOODRUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM. I wonder if it would be possible to reach some agreement on the entire veterans' title. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of having something as a basis for starting I know there are a number of gentlemen interested in this subject and there are a number of paragraphs, and, of course, we are very anxious to conclude the bill this afternoon, and there will probably be other parts of appropriation relating to veterans which Members will want to discuss. I ask unanimous consent that there be 40 minutes' debate under the 5-minute rule on the entire veterans' title, and that during that 40 minutes Members have an opportunity to present amendments, and the Chair can use his own discretion in dividing the time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman arrange it so that this side can get half of the time?

Mr. WOODRUM. I thought perhaps the Chairman would be in a position to exercise his discretion in recognizing Members for and against amendments.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There are a great many requests on this side, and I suggest that the gentleman make it 1 hour.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I suggest the gentleman make it 1 hour on this paragraph.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we have 1 hour's debate on the entire veteran's title and all amendments thereto. My purpose is to allow Members ample opportunity to debate the entire title.

The CHAIRMAN. The entire title has not yet been read. Does the gentleman want to endeavor to limit debate before the entire title is read?

Mr. WOODRUM. I think we could do that by unanimous consent.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. My colleague will surely realize that he can get much more time by the sort of an arrangement proposed by the Chairman.

Mr. McFARLANE. I asked the gentleman for time yesterday and he had plenty of time to give, and he would not give me a minute.

Mr. BLANTON. But we are getting liberal time under the proposed arrangement. If the gentleman forces the Chairman to the strict observance of the rules, many who want to discuss these questions will not be able to get time. We will get much more time by agreement than we will by arbitrary rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests it might be better to limit time on this paragraph and all amendments thereto, and that will save much discussion and probably will be satisfactory to all Members.

Mr. WOODRUM. I suggest 20 minutes on this paragraph.

Mr. HOEPEL. Reserving the right to object, I wish to know whether I will be able to speak 5 minutes on my amendment to this paragraph?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, there are several Members on this side who want to speak on this section. This is very important.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I will change the form of my request. I am only trying to help the gentlemen get time to discuss their amendments.

I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk proceed to read the remainder of the title and that then we have 1 hour's debate and that amendments may be offered to any portion of the title within that hour.

Mr. LEMKE. Reserving the right to object, I would ask the Chairman if he would not consent to 1 hour and 30 minutes? This is a vitally important question.

Mr. HOEPEL. I endeavored to get time on this bill yesterday, and I am going to object unless I am assured of 5 minutes' time on my basic amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOEPEL] objects. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOEPEL. I will withdraw that objection if I am assured of 5 minutes.

Mr. MONTET. Mr. Chairman, the regular order.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph that has just been read and all amendments thereto, close in 30 minutes.

Mr. BOILEAU. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, we find so many times when we go into this procedure that Members who have bona fide amendments to offer have no time in which to discuss them. The entire 30 minutes may be consumed in discussing pro forma amendments. We have plenty of time this afternoon. This title is the only title that offers any opportunity for amendment. It seems to me we could well afford to spend 2 hours on this vitally important subject.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. If my colleague, Mr. WOODRUM, will change his request and ask that the entire title be read and then there shall be 1 hour and 20 minutes' debate, in which all amendments may be offered, I think probably we can get an agreement.

Mr. WOODRUM. I make that request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BOILEAU. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Virginia state his request, please?

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk proceed to read all of the title, and that then amendments be in order to any portion of the title, and that debate on all amendments to the title be limited to 1 hour and 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph that has just been read and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the motion is not in order. We have not started debate on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts was debating the paragraph, and yielded to me. The gentleman offered an amendment and was debating it and then yielded to me.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the understanding of the Chair that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] yielded to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] to prefer a unanimous consent request, but there was no debate on the amendment. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yet started to run.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. If the motion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] should prevail, limiting the debate on this paragraph to 30 minutes, how much time can be consumed on any one amendment?

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman, how much time can be consumed by one Member? I desire to offer an amendment. I wish an opportunity to discuss my amendment, and do not want all the time taken up by others.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize in regular order, so far as the Chair can, those who have notified the Chair of their desire to speak.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the Chair's attention to the RECORD. The RECORD will show that the gentleman from Massachusetts offered an amendment and proceeded to debate the amendment. The RECORD will show that the gentleman spoke for a minute, or half a minute at least. He said:

This is one of the most important amendments that will be voted on and I hope my friend from Virginia will be liberal and allow gentlemen opportunity to debate this amendment.

Then I asked him if he would yield to me.

This is debate on the section, and, under the rule, I have the right to move to close debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the floor and may proceed if he so desires. After he has used his 5 minutes the Chair will then recognize the gentleman from Virginia to make such motion as he may desire.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to add \$8,000,000 to the \$77,273,000 provided for in this bill and to assure the continuance of the present regional offices which, if this bill is passed without amendment, will ultimately be abolished.

It is a plain, simple question as to whether you want regional offices of the Veterans' Bureau throughout the United States to be abolished or whether you want to have all veterans' activities emanate from Washington.

So far as I am concerned, I am opposed to abolishing the regional offices of the Veterans' Bureau. I am opposed to making the men come to Washington from all parts of the country to file a claim or to prosecute any appeal they are taking from any decision which has been rendered against them. I am opposed to many things which will flow as a result of the regulations issued pursuant to the passage of the Economy Act. The regulations issued clearly justify my vote against the economy bill.

A statement appeared in this morning's papers purporting to come from President Roosevelt to the effect that the regulations recently issued are to be liberalized. I sincerely trust there will be a liberalization of these regulations, because an examination of the same will show that veterans with direct service-connected disabilities are affected anywhere from 20 percent to 55 percent, together with other far-reaching effects. There is no question but what there is plenty of room and justification for liberalization, and if this happens, there is no question but what regional offices will have to be retained.

The adoption of my amendment will mean that the regional offices throughout the country will continue to exist and serve veterans. It will provide the appropriation necessary to enable the executive branch of the Government to continue all regional offices.

I have a very interesting telegram which I am going to read into the RECORD. It was sent to me yesterday by Karl C. Payne, of Boston, who has, apparently, seen the error of his ways. This telegram reads as follows:

Veterans' division, National Economy League, urges retention of regional office of Veterans' Bureau in Boston. Absolutely essential for proper handling of the deserving veterans.

That is the Economy League. If it is deserving to hold the office in Boston it is just as deserving to hold the regional offices in any other city in the United States. While I am fighting to retain the regional office in Boston, the adoption of my amendment will also mean the retention of the regional offices throughout the United States.

Mr. GRANFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I gladly yield to my distinguished friend, Mr. GRANFIELD, from Massachusetts.

Mr. GRANFIELD. I am absolutely in accord with amendment offered by my good friend, Mr. McCORMACK, and I sincerely trust it will be adopted.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my good friend, Mr. GRANFIELD, for his contribution and his views on the amendment which I have offered. I also want to say that I know of no man who better serves his district and is more loyal to the needs of the veterans than Mr. GRANFIELD.

Those who voted for the economy bill, never intending by their vote to have the regulations go as far as they have gone, can do the best thing possible by voting to retain the regional offices.

I sincerely trust that in plain justice and fairness, and as a message to the American people and to our veterans, that we are going to do everything we reasonably and properly can to have the regulations liberalized. The adoption of this amendment will send such a message to the country.

Mr. McGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. McGUGIN. Will the gentleman's amendment really preserve these regional offices?

Mr. McCORMACK. At least the amendment will be a message that we desire them retained. It provides for their retention at least, so far as the appropriation is concerned, and, so far as we are concerned, we will be doing everything we possibly can when we adopt it.

Mr. McGUGIN. But its adoption does not necessarily mean the retention of the regional offices.

Mr. McCORMACK. But, so far as we are concerned, it will show the people we want to retain them and we will have done everything within our power. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, did the gentleman ask unanimous consent that debate close on the section or on the paragraph?

Mr. WOODRUM. I asked unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Has not the Chair the discretion to recognize the various Members who have requested time, say, for 2 or 3 minutes each? Quite a number of Members have indicated they wish to be heard on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the Chair would have the right to do so if it is satisfactory to the individual Members.

Mr. BLANTON. I think such procedure would give those who wish to be heard on the paragraph an opportunity to present their views.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all speeches on amendments to this paragraph be limited to 2 minutes.

Mr. HOEPEL and Mr. DIRKSEN objected.

Mr. HOEPEL and Mr. MEAD rose.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes and have the time deducted from the 30 minutes allowed for debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman in favor of the amendment?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would prefer to recognize at this time someone in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the additional appropriation of funds as provided in this amendment, not that I am opposed to the maintenance of regional offices, but I have an amendment lying on the desk which will positively save this Government \$20,000,000, or more, if the Veterans' Administration, which I term the largest racket in Government, will use the facilities of the Army and Navy hospitals, which are available to them. Thus this additional appropriation will not be necessary.

It is my opinion Al Capone and his ilk are virgins and saints compared with the keymen in the Veterans' Administration. I have investigated them and I know. They are inefficient, incompetent, and unsympathetic. They are interested in their own politically acquired sinecures and not in justice to the veteran. Hospitalization in the Veterans' Administration hospitals costs 97 cents per day more per patient than does hospitalization in Army or Navy hospitals. There are 6,000 available beds in Army and Navy hospitals, which the Veterans' Administration should utilize because of decreased cost per patient. Instead of using these cheaper and more competent permanent facilities the Veterans' Administration is withdrawing patients from them and endeavoring to build additions to their present hospitals in

an endeavor to retain their higher-paid medical and service personnel, which is a distinct loss to the taxpayers.

It is reported such activities are now taking place at Fort Lyons, Colo., and at San Francisco at an unnecessary expense to the taxpayers.

It is contrary to the President's policy of economy not to accept the cheapest and best facilities available.

I am not opposing the regional offices, but I aver economies can be effected which will save \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000 if the services of officers to be furloughed are also utilized in these facilities. There are 6,000 beds now available which if utilized at a saving of 97 cents per day will make a saving of over \$171,000 per month over and above savings in personnel salaries. Veterans' Administration doctors receive up to \$5,800 per annum, while the salary of the average Army and Navy doctor is \$4,000. Instead of furloughing these officers at half pay for life, which is a pure loss to the taxpayer, it would be more profitable to retain them in service and release the higher-salaried, incompetent, and aged doctors in the Veterans' Administration.

This Government should use every available facility of the Army and Navy hospitals, not only in the interest of economy but likewise maintaining the high standard of efficiency and morale now existing in these services.

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Are these speeches being made on the amendment now pending, one speech for the amendment and one speech against?

The CHAIRMAN. As near as the Chair can determine that fact; yes.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Mr. Chairman, my point of order is that one speech for and one speech against the amendment is all the time allowed on one amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. But there can be a motion to strike out the last word, which would entitle them to recognition. The Chair will endeavor to be fair and try to divide the time so as to include everyone.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the committee, is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak for a moment with reference to the hospital situation in the United States.

We have at the present time 32,542 beds in Veterans' Bureau hospitals. We have in the national soldiers' homes 6,070 beds. There are 12,009 cases in the veterans' hospitals that are service connected. In the other hospitals there are 8,012 that are service-connected cases. About 20,000 of the 41,439 beds that are available are occupied by service-connected cases.

As I understand the policy of the administration, after this law goes into effect the non-service-connected cases will be cast out of the hospitals, and I am just wondering whether this will be best for our country—that is, when we have these beds available whether it will be the best thing for us to cast aside these men who are unable to take care of themselves and throw them back on the various communities from which they have been sent to the hospitals.

With the inauguration of President Roosevelt and the convening of this special session of Congress, I, like the great majority of my Republican colleagues, threw partisanship to the four winds and determined to follow the leadership of the Chief Executive in his avowed program of economy in Government, tempered with mercy and justice to those who were to be affected by the reduction in expenditures.

The Congress by overwhelming majority enacted the President's economy bill, giving the President unprecedented powers, and repealing laws affecting millions of men and women who served their country in time of peril, which were the result of countless hours and days—yes, years of sincere deliberation by Members of the Congress. We were told that the President would deal liberally with those whose disabilities were service-connected. During the Presidential

campaign the Democratic Party fanned the flame of hatred in the breasts of the veterans against Herbert Hoover and Republicans in Congress, leading them to believe that only by the election of the Democratic candidates could their legislative programs become a law, with the result that leaders of the great veteran organizations appeared in the front-line trenches of the Democratic Party, and it is probably conservative to say that 80 percent of the veteran vote supported the "new deal."

By our votes we became a party to the proposed wholesale dismissals in the ranks of Federal workers and subscribed to the 15-percent reduction in all salaries, to which in many instances must be added administrative furloughs without pay ranging from 30 to 90 days. Men and women who have served their Government in departmental and field service faithfully and well at mediocre salaries, because they felt that they were protected by Civil Service laws, making it possible for them to look forward to security in their old age, are now faced with the specter of unemployment as the result of the "new deal", which in the same breath calls upon private employers to increase wages and employment.

While we are throwing thousands of faithful Civil Service employees into the ranks of unemployed, we are at the same time asked to create new governmental activities, requiring the services of thousands of persons, who will be recruited from the ranks of political workers, who can prove their active support of the Democratic candidate even before his nomination for the Presidency. I am convinced that the cry of economy as applied to the dismissal of Federal workers is camouflage, and that when the smoke has cleared away we will find that the personnel of the Government will be as large, if not larger than before, except that we will have scrapped the Civil Service ideals of the first Roosevelt for the patronage hand of the "new deal."

Twelve months ago thousands of veterans and their families were spurred on to Washington by the encouraging words of men in this House, who insisted on the payment of the adjusted-service certificates with printing-press money. The administration at that time did not favor that kind of currency. The veterans themselves made an honest effort to shake off their backs those among their number who were infected by the insidious disease of communism, which is obnoxious to all sound-thinking Americans. During the presidential campaign the eviction of the Bonus Expeditionary Force, greatly exaggerated by the propagandists, was used with telling effect by the adherents of the "new deal". Today we have gathering in the Capital another such force, divided as before in two camps, one with the sanction of the administration, whose leaders are known communists, whose prime purpose is the overthrow of our Government and the advancement of Soviet Russia. The other group, who cling to American ideals, are not admitted to the councils at the other end of the Avenue unless they affiliate themselves with Levine, the red leader, but instead are told that they can only remain 24 hours, after which they will presumably be removed by the police. In the meantime Congress has given the President authority to expand the currency, which he will likely do. I voted against that authority. Is it not strange that those men who urged the payment of the adjusted-service certificates with that kind of money 12 months ago are today silent; they now say they have no desire to "throw a monkey wrench in the machinery." It is evident, therefore, that their purpose last year was to throw a monkey wrench in the machinery of the Republican Party and not that of aiding the veteran.

I have today received letters from veterans of the World War and the Spanish-American War whose disabilities are of unquestioned service origin who have received notice that they were either to be seriously cut in the amount of compensation they receive or removed from the rolls completely. One, a World War veteran, who had received a total permanent award together with insurance payments, is now advised that he is 25 percent permanently disabled and will receive \$20 per month. Another, a Spanish-American War veteran, who was awarded a pension at a time when service

connection was required, had been advised that his pension will be discontinued.

These two cases are similar to thousands of others being reported to the Members of this House; they indicate the spirit of justice and mercy that the administration is imbued with in reviewing the cases of disabled veterans. To me such action is convincing evidence that every Member of Congress who voted to grant these autocratic powers to the President were misled by the leaders of this House when they assured us as spokesmen for the administration that such things would not occur. I have always felt that there was plenty of room for economy in our Federal structure, even to the extent of the appropriations for veterans' activities, but certainly did not imagine for one minute that we would deny those who suffer from disabilities incurred in the war-time service a just rate of compensation.

I note in this morning's paper that the President expects to allay the drastic results of his regulations. It is evident that he failed to grasp the import of them when issued. Are we to experiment with human lives? Are we to create human misery? It is said that Congress will adjourn within the next 3 or 4 weeks—the President desires it. Shall we pull down the flag, without knowing what course the Ship of State will steer? It is time we pause and take our bearings, before the threatening storm obscures the landmarks and engulfs our craft.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I request that the Membership vote for this amendment which was drafted by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and myself. At this particular time it would be a great hardship on the disabled veterans of America to abolish these regional offices. There are some 350,000 men who have been drawing disability allowance. These men, many of them, have service-connected cases before them. If these regional offices are abolished, you will find that it will be impossible for these men for months to come to be able to get any kind of hearing at all. The amendment is merely directory; it merely expresses the approval of Congress that for the present year we want to continue the regional offices so that every man, as I have said, whose disability would have permitted the right to go and have sufficient force to investigate and find out whether he has service-connected disability or not.

Mr. HOEPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I cannot, for I have only 3 minutes. In these cases, and I have been in the hospitals from one end of the country to the other, I know of hundreds of cases of men drawing disability allowance who should have had service-connected disabilities. I have known men in my own county and State and elsewhere, who, under this rigorous policy that the law has placed upon them at this time, ought to have the opportunity to have the protection of this great Government thrown around them for their services in the past. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Texas for or against the amendment?

Mr. BLANTON. I am supporting the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for 3 minutes.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, and I should like to inquire the proper time to offer it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman's proposed amendment to the pending amendment?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. It has no relation to the pending amendment.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. How many amendments are there pending?

The CHAIRMAN. There is only one amendment pending.

Mr. BOILEAU. I understand that there are several amendments to be offered to this paragraph, and I should like to know if the Member offering the amendment cannot have a minute or two to explain it?

The CHAIRMAN. When the gentleman from Texas concludes, the Chair will have all the amendments read for information.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, in the State of Texas there are 2 regional offices, 1 at San Antonio in the southwestern portion of the State and the other at Dallas, they being nearly 300 miles apart.

The San Antonio office has jurisdiction of the cases of veterans living in about a third of the counties in my district, and the Dallas office has jurisdiction of the cases of the veterans living in the remaining counties of my district.

Ever since the close of the war practically all of the veterans in my district have gotten me to handle their cases. This handling had to be done either with the regional office at San Antonio or the regional office at Dallas. When Congress was not in session, and I could be at home in Abilene, I could handle their cases with dispatch. But Congress is in session much of the time, and my official duties have required me to be here in Washington, about 2,000 miles from my constituents, much of the time. At first, when I would be in Washington, veterans would call on me to help them file application for compensation or for hospitalization, and it would take 4 days for their letter to come from my district to Washington, and then it would take 4 more days for my letter to the regional office at San Antonio or Dallas to get the application blank and other data sent them; and frequently it was necessary for them to write me back and forth before completing their application and proof, and then it would take 4 more days for them to send the completed papers to me, and 4 more days for me to send the completed papers back to Dallas or San Antonio, and sooner or later in most of the cases I finally would have to take them up with the Administration in Washington before they reached a conclusion. This back-and-forth process of coming 2,000 miles from my district to Washington and mailing back 2,000 miles from Washington to my district caused such interminable delays that I was forced to establish an office in Abilene, open the year round, so that veterans could be aided in preparing their various kinds of cases.

I rented two rooms in Abilene devoted exclusively to official business at a cost to me out of my own funds of \$600 per year, and out of my own funds I went to the expense of furnishing and equipping it, and I keep there the year round a secretary to help veterans prepare their applications for compensation, insurance, hospitalization, and all other relief authorized by law, furnishing to them free notary service wholly without charge. My Texas office helps them get up all of their proof, obtaining certified copies of certificates of marriage, certificates of birth, decrees of divorce, certificates of death, physicians' certificates of examination and treatment, military records, hospital records, and various affidavits of every kind, nature and description from witnesses scattered all over the United States, and some even from foreign countries, to make for them the proof required by the administration. If I had not gone to that trouble and expense, their cases could not have been handled with dispatch, and they would have suffered delays which in instances meant life and death to them.

I have maintained at my own expense this contact office in Texas not only to benefit the veterans of the World War but also to render service to the veterans of the Spanish-American War, and of the Indian Wars and Ranger service performed on the early frontiers.

In Hon. Read Johnson, regional manager of the Dallas office, we have an able, efficient, worthy, and patriotic official, warmly sympathetic with the disabilities and problems of all veterans; but I have found that many veterans are wholly dissatisfied with the action taken by regional offices, and they insist constantly that they may have the privilege of having their cases reviewed by the administration at Washington. I have had many veterans to appeal to me saying, "For God's sake take my case away from the regional office and get it to Washington." And ultimately

many of the cases have to be reviewed in Washington, necessitating much duplication, much expense, and much dissatisfaction.

In many instances when veterans apply for immediate hospitalization, when the need is serious and urgent, it is necessary for the regional office to get instructions and permission from Washington before the veteran can be admitted to a hospital.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I regret that I have not the time, otherwise I would gladly yield to my friend.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry that I have not the time, otherwise I would gladly yield to my friend from North Carolina. I am not sure that veterans have been benefited by having regional offices. I am not sure that the veterans themselves are satisfied altogether with the services given them by regional offices. If it were left to the vote of the veterans themselves, I am not sure that they would want the regional offices continued. It is problematical. After all, we are the ones who handle the cases for them.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me? I yielded to him yesterday.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I always yield to my very distinguished colleague, the esteemed gentlewoman from Massachusetts. I could not refuse her request.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman spend some of his time in Texas? Does he not want to handle cases in the Texas office when he is in Texas?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly, but when the Texas office does not do as they want it to do, I finally have to have them reviewed in Washington. Ultimately we all have to have many cases handled by Washington, and ultimately the final decision is made in Washington. This is a duplication of effort, and is a duplication of expense, and in many instances is most unsatisfactory to the veterans themselves.

However, regardless of whether the regional offices are beneficial or not, today's press brings us a message from the White House assuring us that these regional offices will not be abolished. President Roosevelt is going to have his administration retain them, hence we need not worry here about any fear of having them abolished. They are not going to be abolished. And since this is the only bill that appropriates money for veterans, we must pass it. If we do not pass it, there will be no money for hospitals, or for compensation, or for pensions. It is suggested that the bill be recommitted back to the committee. That means no bill. That means to kill it. That means no funds for veterans or for hospitals. Unless we pass this bill before we adjourn, there will be no help whatever for any veterans after the first day of July.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL] to offer an amendment for information.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL: Page 46, line 15, after the colon, insert "Provided further, That the appropriations herein carried for maintaining hospital services under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration shall be available, not to exceed \$5,000, for experimental purposes to determine the value of certain types of treatment."

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment inserts in the present bill a provision that is carried in the current appropriation act for the independent offices, except that it reduces the amount from \$15,000 to \$5,000. This requires no increase in the appropriation of moneys provided in this bill, but simply makes available out of that money—that is, the money that is provided for hospitalization and medical care—a fund of \$5,000, and not to exceed \$5,000, for the treatment of certain diseases in an experimental way, being intended in particular for the treatment of Buerger's disease. This same appropriation in a larger

amount is carried in the current appropriation act for the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. If I may supplement what the gentleman says, this merely permits the Veterans' Administration to use as much of its appropriation as it may deem necessary, not to exceed \$5,000, for certain types of treatment, and is aimed particularly at treatment being given to some veterans at Soap Lake, Wash.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. An authorization that has been carried in this bill heretofore and was originally put in by our former colleague, Dr. Summers. So far as the committee is concerned, we have no objection to the amendment of the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], chairman of the subcommittee, I offer my amendment and yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNUTE HILL. Mr. Chairman, I want to support the amendment of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL]. This amendment provides a \$5,000 appropriation for treatment of veterans for Buerger's disease at Soap Lake, Wash., which is in the Fourth District, which I represent.

Last year the appropriation was \$15,000. We have reduced that to \$5,000.

Of all the casualties of the World War, I believe none is more pathetic than the veteran who is afflicted with what is known as Buerger's disease, which means a slow death, literally inch by inch; and I think inasmuch as we have appropriated here \$50,000 to dig up the bones of old, prehistoric animals, we can at least appropriate \$5,000 to save the bones of living veterans who offered to make the supreme sacrifice in the World War.

The cases at Soap Lake are pitiable. They have sought relief everywhere else in vain. The suffering is so intense that it drives them almost to insanity. Amputations are frequent, and eventually result in complete loss of the limbs. At Soap Lake they have secured relief, with hope of ultimate recovery.

In one case a wife writes for extension of appropriation as they have purchased a home, expecting to spend his remaining days there. He has secured relief there, and she begs that he be not sent back to the saw and knife.

One who has been greatly benefited flew recently from Soap Lake to Washington, D.C., to present his case before General Hines. His comrades furnished the funds. General Hines, I am informed, was impressed by the improved condition of this veteran to the extent of promising continued experiments if appropriation was made by Congress.

Affidavits from all these veterans attesting to the remedial effects secured at this place and by these treatments are on file in our offices and at the Veterans' Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SHOEMAKER] to offer an amendment for information.

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHOEMAKER to the amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: Strike out "\$85,273,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$110,538,514."

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to see any cut made. I have been around veterans' hospitals, and I know the situation. In fact, just a week before I came down here, I came out of a veterans' hospital at Fort Snelling. We are talking about saving these regional hospitals. I have here newspaper clippings from Minneapolis and St. Paul, showing that 86 doctors, dentists, and nurses have been left off up there and put out of their work. Not only that, but 300 more are slated to go up there, and they are figuring on boarding up that hospital. I know that for years it has

been almost impossible for the veterans to get into that hospital. I have hundreds of them who are clamoring to get into that hospital, and who are in dire need of hospitalization. I feel this should not be cut at all, and for that reason my amendment calls for the original appropriation we had in the last year, bringing it back up to where we can take care of these people, these people that are sick and need attention. I hope that at least we will be able to do something for the sick soldiers. It is bad enough to take a lot of compensation from those who do not happen to be as sick as some who need hospitalization and cannot get it. I am opposed to further placing the burden of taxation upon our local taxpayers and further taking it off the large-income-tax dodger who supports the National Economy League. That is why I submit the amendment under discussion and why I shall support it. And I trust that this House will at least try to offset some of the damage that was brought about through the passage of the so-called "economy bill." Why take more crutches away from crippled soldiers? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There are reasons why the regional offices ought to be maintained to a certain extent to carry on the functions that have been carried on. A very large number of them can be carried on at a great deal less expense than they have in the past, and a large number of them can be consolidated with hospital activities in the different places. Frankly, we had an appropriation of about \$110,000,000 laid out for this year. I do not believe that with the 15-percent cut, taking into consideration the operating expenses, and the way they probably will be cut, with the reduction in those who will be entitled to admission to hospitals, we will require nearly as much money as we did before. The President has control of this situation, and it does not make any difference how much money we carry. Only such money will be used as he feels is necessary to run the hospitals on the basis of the regulations that he proposes.

He has it figured up what will be required. I do not see why we should give more money than he has requested on the basis of what he figures he is going to do.

Another thing, this does not take effect until July 1, and it is possible with the appropriation, the way it stands in the bill, to carry along beyond such time as may be necessary to complete the adjudication of those cases, where no consolidation with a hospital can take place in the district. I really believe we ought not to crowd on to the President more money than he has asked for.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My understanding is that in asking for only \$34,000,000 the Veterans' Administration had to eliminate a large sum of money that it really needed for the proper care of veterans in the hospitals.

Mr. TABER. That is not what General Hines told us.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will send to the Veterans' Administration he will find it to be true that if \$8,000,000 is spent for the regional offices, a very drastic cut must be made in the care of the veterans. Yesterday the President stated he would keep them open. This was done after vigorous protests against their closing had been made by many of us. Legion Post No. 87, of Lowell, Mass., made a very strong protest. We must take care of the TB cases and other sick veterans. We do not want them to die for lack of proper care, as they easily can. The responsibility clearly belongs to the President to take humane care of the veterans. Congress gave him the power to do so. He has stated only recently that he will liberalize the very drastic regulations. It is our responsibility to see that money is appropriated for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

Mr. TABER. The bill carries \$77,000,000 for this purpose and not \$34,000,000. The cut in this appropriation is \$34,-

000,000. The 15 percent salary cut would account for half of this and the balance is accounted for in reductions in hospital and administration expenses. I do not believe that any needed activity will suffer from the defeat of this amendment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is correct. I did not mean to say \$34,000,000, as I know that is the amount cut in the appropriation. The amount of the appropriation is approximately \$77,000,000—

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no Member of this House in my desire to go 100 percent in enforcing and maintaining economy in this Nation, but when we go so far as to pass legislation in this body which effects the lives, the future, and welfare of the men who were wounded, injured, and suffered in defense of our country in the World War, I say we must call a halt. Therefore I propose to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] in respect to the regional offices in connection with this bill.

We ourselves are under a solemn obligation, not only in the interest of our own districts, of our own States, and of our own Nation, to do everything that is legally and morally possible to further economy in this Nation, but we are also under an equally persuasive obligation to see to it that the men who protected the integrity of this Nation in the World War shall not be left behind. We talk about a new deal. Let us have a square deal, an honest deal, and let us do our part to enable this administration to do what it is ready to do in a statement reported in today's papers as coming direct from the White House, to wit:

By reason of the burden incident to rerating, and in order that undue hardship will not be imposed upon veterans in their application for adjudication of their cases, regional offices of the Veterans' Administration will not be closed as has been reported, except where it has been clearly demonstrated that regional facilities are not necessary.

It is not contemplated that Government hospitals will be closed pending a careful, studious survey of the entire hospital situation. This, of necessity, will require considerable time.

These conclusions are in line with the President's original statement that the regulations and schedules would be drafted so as to effect the most humane possible treatment of veterans purely disabled in war service.

Let us give the administration an opportunity to say that the Congress, the voice of the people, does not desire to have these regional offices closed, and in keeping them open we will be doing our share toward rendering our thanks for the deeds of valor, bravery, patriotism, and honor by those who fought and bled and were ready to give their very lives for us in the great World War.

I hope this amendment will be adopted. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ROGERS] has expired.

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I think the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, in answer to an inquiry by the able gentleman from Kansas, expressed a very wise thought. The gentleman said that this was an opportunity for us at least to let those in authority, and the people on the outside, know how Congress feels about this all-important matter.

I voted for the economy bill, and I have been prepared, and am prepared, without apology, to go down this uncertain path with the leader of my party and the leader of our country; but I think we have a very definite chance today, and perhaps the last chance, to give this expression of opinion, referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

In this morning's paper we were advised there was to be some change in the method of procedure, and we who know of the bleeding hearts of those who are threatened with suffering because of the regulations originally announced are very hopeful, as a result of what was said in the press this morning, that the soldiers themselves will be given a chance to be heard in connection with how the matter will be handled from this time on. Those high in authority have had the benefit of the opinion of the cold, practical side. Those who were maimed in war and robbed of whatever romance there may be in war have yet to be heard officially,

and I do not think anyone here would deny them a chance to be heard now.

I have the same great faith in President Roosevelt that I had as I voted with him in his economy efforts. I am satisfied he would burn at the stake rather than sacrifice his fixed opinions; but before his opinion is finally and fully formed I hope the heads of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Veterans of the Spanish-American War, as well as the Legion head, may get a chance to present their side of the case. I do not think this great leader of ours will permit his group of supporters in this Congress to go around with bowed head and a crushed conscience. I know he will bring about a correction. I hope we may continue the faith we have, the patience that we need, and give him the chance that is so necessary to rectify the mistakes that have been made, and to keep faith with the defenders of the Nation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to announce that the time has been limited. Twenty-five minutes have been consumed. The Chair arbitrarily reduced the time to 3 minutes for each speaker. There are only 5 minutes remaining.

Five Members have not had an opportunity to speak, but the Chair feels the Chair should recognize the chairman of the committee to close the debate.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. JEFFERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, that I may submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WOODRUM. I should like to finish, but I yield.

Mr. JEFFERS. Mr. Chairman, no member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has had an opportunity to be heard. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] and myself have both asked for time. We are the ranking members on the floor.

I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] and myself be allowed to speak for 2½ minutes each.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think if this extension is granted these gentlemen that the same length of time should be granted to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I believe if the request were modified so as to permit each Member who has an amendment pending on the desk the same amount of time, there would be no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the chairman of the subcommittee accept as a compromise a request that these gentlemen and those who have amendments pending at the desk be allowed to proceed for 1 minute each? It has not been possible for the Chair to recognize five Members who have sent amendments to the desk.

Mr. WOODRUM. I make that request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that each Member who has an amendment pending at the desk be allowed to proceed for 1 minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFERS. Mr. Chairman, thousands of veterans in every State have received notice that they are going to be cut off the 1st of July. They received notice at the same time that as soon as possible after that date they would have an opportunity to refile their cases and make an effort to prove service connection, if possible. It would be an absolute physical impossibility for all these veterans to come to Washington to present their evidence after filing their claims anew. To require them to do so would bring about a condition of utter chaos and confusion.

It is essential, therefore, that the regional offices be continued so that the men can get to the regional offices to renew their claims and so field workers can go out from regional offices and contact the men when necessary.

The regional offices should not be cut off, and this expression from the legislative branch providing funds so that regional offices can be retained will, I feel, be infor-

mation which our Chief Executive will welcome. I am in entire agreement with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] who has offered this amendment, and I sincerely trust it will be adopted as an expression of sentiment in this House in favor of the retention of these regional offices in our respective States. I am naturally especially concerned about the one located in my own State, at Birmingham, Ala. I hope the amendment will pass. [Applause.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, some years ago Congress appropriated \$3,000,000 to eradicate the fruit fly from the orange groves of Florida.

They spent \$25,000 to preserve order at Harding's inauguration.

They spent \$5,000 to hang Coolidge's picture in one of these galleries.

They granted \$50,000,000 for Muscle Shoals.

They gave \$500,000,000 lavishly for relief.

Now comes the beseeching veteran and says, "Please give us \$8,000,000 so we can keep the regional offices open."

The question is whether their demand and their beseechings will fall on deaf ears or be given the same consideration that was given to some of the material and commercial things for which we have literally broadcast and scattered millions of dollars—yes, billions of dollars. This is identified with a humane cause. The answer lies with the Membership of the body.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, the reason the amount of increase was fixed at \$8,000,000 in the amendment was because at a recent conference of officials of the American Legion at Indianapolis it was estimated it would cost about \$8,000,000 to maintain the regional offices. I have offered the same amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

If the regional offices are closed, about 2,000,000 cases will be returned to Washington for revision and adjudication.

The Federal Government is about to stop the compensation and allowances of thousands of veterans and is about to substantially reduce compensation and allowance to thousands of others. These men will naturally ask for hearings. If they cannot go to their local regional offices and present their cases, the right of hearing will effectually be denied them. These men are going to realize that their court of appeal has been removed from them, for most of them will not have the money to pay the expenses of a trip to Washington, and we will have taken away the right of appeal from these men who wore the uniform of their country.

If we abolish the regional offices and thus in effect deny a day in court to the veteran who was wounded in the service of his country, you will certainly be doing him a grave injustice.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and I trust it will be adopted by the Committee. I am opposed to the closing of the regional offices of the Veterans' Bureau because there is no economy in it. It will increase the cost to the Government. We could just as well have closed these regional offices a year after the World War as we can now. When we passed the economy bill, with its revolutionary revision of rates, when the Veterans' Administration issued regulations affecting some 2,000,000 cases, and when the President of the United States, in a reported statement emanating from the White House last night, signified his willingness to review these cases, the work of these regional offices increased, and they will be more necessary now than at any time within the past 10 years.

This is the wrong time to close these offices. Such a reduction would strike with undue severity the poor veteran who, either because he cannot afford to come to Washington or because his case is not in a favored class, will have to pay his own way if he desires to have his case heard. Economy, efficiency, and fairness will result in the adoption of this amendment.

We may close these offices sometime, but this is surely the wrong time. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I disagree with my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] as to the efficiency of the Washington office and the regional offices.

The Washington office has always been nothing but a rubber stamp, anyway. All your appeal boards down here you might as well throw out the window. The veteran gets nothing in Washington. Whatever little he does get he gets from the regional offices. They should be retained, if the veteran is to get anything at all.

I hope the McCormack amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Chairman, as has just been stated, if there ever was a time when we needed these regional offices, it is now.

The President has stated, according to the press, that there have been some grave injustices done under his order, and as the days go by many more will be discovered by him. If the regional offices are not retained, where these men can have a hearing, I will say to the gentleman from Texas, who states that he has an office established there now, he will need 2 or 3 more of them if he has to do this work.

I think these offices ought to be retained, and I do believe that if they are retained much of the injustice that has been done to many of the soldiers, as we see it now, will be corrected by the regional offices without having to have it done here.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. I am supporting the McCormack amendment and hope it will be adopted. The chairman of the committee made the statement yesterday that more than 10,000 are now drawing compensation who did not join the Army until after the armistice was signed. It may be true that many are on the rolls who do not deserve to be there. Many civilians who have ample finances have received free hospital treatment. These abuses are going to be corrected. But we are now dealing with the sick and disabled, and I am going to do everything in my power to see to it that they get just and fair treatment. Some of the rules and regulations promulgated by the Veterans' Bureau cannot be defended. I am happy to see by the Associated Press today that the President says that the cut in service-connected cases was deeper than intended. He assures us that justice will be done in every case, and I have implicit faith in him always doing the right and fair thing.

I am opposed to closing the regional offices. I have personal knowledge of the fine work they have done. The main office in my part of the country is at Albuquerque, with a branch office in my city of El Paso. I have made vigorous protest against closing the El Paso office. They have handled several thousand cases. It should not be forgotten that hundreds of veterans have gone to the high, dry climate of the Southwest, suffering from tuberculosis. Many of them are bed-ridden. That is a country of great distances. Many of the men are physically unable to personally look after their claims. The representatives of the regional office have gone out in the field when the men could not come to the office and have rendered valuable assistance. They should not have to write Washington and suffer long delays in order to get their claims adjusted. There is no economy in it, because extra men will be required here if the district offices are closed. All doubts should be resolved in favor of the sick and disabled. I am for economy and am supporting the President's program, but let us be sure in dealing with sick veterans that justice is done.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 seconds.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that if we do not keep these regional offices open, every Member of Congress is going to be a regional office after they are closed. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I hope I may have the undivided attention of the Committee. The debate for the last 30 minutes demonstrates pretty clearly how far we can

go when we allow sometimes our zeal and our feelings to overshadow our better judgment.

Now, I know how deeply interested Members of Congress feel in this matter of the regional offices, and the debate here has been practically unanimous that they are to be kept open.

The interesting part of it is that the President has already said that they are going to be kept open, because yesterday the national commander of the American Legion came to Washington, saw the President, and the morning press carried an article which I am sure most of the Members of Congress have read. I want to read it to you. It is as follows:

The White House announced last night that economies to be effected through reduction of payments to veterans for service-connected disabilities would be reviewed with a view to making the cuts less severe.

A statement issued by Stephen T. Early, Secretary to the President, said:

"As a result of conferences between the President, the national commander of the American Legion, Louis Johnson, and the Director of the Budget, the following conclusions have been reached:

"As a result of the application of the veterans' regulations, it now seems that the cut in compensation of service-connected World War veterans with specific injuries has been deeper than originally intended. The regulations and schedules in this respect will therefore be reviewed so as to effect more equitable levels of payment. Careful study also will be made of the other regulations and their effects.

#### "REGIONAL OFFICES SAVED

"By reason of the burden incident to rerating and in order that undue hardship will not be imposed upon veterans in their application for adjudication of their cases, regional offices of the Veterans' Administration will not be closed, as has been reported, except where it has been clearly demonstrated that regional facilities are not necessary.

"It is not contemplated that Government hospitals will be closed pending a careful, studious survey of the entire hospital situation. This of necessity will require considerable time.

"These conclusions are in line with the President's original statement that the regulations and schedules would be drafted so as to effect the most humane possible treatment of veterans purely disabled in war service."

I hold in my hand a statement by the Director of the Budget and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, made at the request of the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, stating that it is not necessary to increase the funds in this appropriation bill on account of the regional offices:

MAY 11, 1933.

HON. JAMES P. BUCHANAN,  
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BUCHANAN: Having reference to the statement appearing in the newspapers this morning with respect to the veterans' regulations, I enclose a letter from General Hines which states that no increase will be necessary in the present estimates of appropriation. With this conclusion I agree.

Very truly yours,

L. W. DOUGLAS, Director.

MAY 11, 1933.

MR. LEWIS W. DOUGLAS,  
Director Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. DOUGLAS: Reference is made to the press release issued by the White House on May 10, 1933, concerning the regulations promulgated under Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress.

The policies outlined in the release are those which have been in effect since the President signed these regulations, as is indicated in the last paragraph of the release.

Insofar as reduction of compensation in service-connected cases is concerned, the Veterans' Administration from the date of issuance of the regulations, in accordance with the instructions of the President, has been studying the effects of the new rating schedule and will continue to do so on the basis of reports being received as to its application in individual cases. When estimates were made and submitted covering this item, allowance for any necessary adjustments as might be required was included.

As to the closing of regional offices and hospitals, the release outlines the policy which is being followed.

I can see no necessity, by reason of the above-referred-to release, for increasing the amounts now contained in the independent offices appropriation bill which is now pending before the House of Representatives.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES, Administrator.

Now, gentlemen, I plead with you here today to trust the President in formulating and promulgating his regulations. It has been demonstrated that the President is going to take

a reasonable view of the matter in response to the interview with the commander of the Legion and that he is not going to close these offices.

It does not do any good to put money in the bill if he does not want to use it. There is sufficient money provided for the regional offices. Let us give the President a chance; let us give him an opportunity to work it out, because I say to you again what I said when we adopted the economy bill, that I am willing to trust the President to give the veteran a square deal. Some cuts may seem drastic, and many of them will no doubt be reviewed and changed.

I ask you to give the President a fair chance to work this thing out under the regulations he has formulated.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. The gentleman ought to have made this speech before we began this debate.

Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts. In the report that was made in explaining the reduction of \$34,000,000, it was stated that it was on the ground that there would be a curtailment of hospitalization, and among other measures adopted the abolishment of the regional offices. How can the gentleman say that if all the regional offices are to be retained?

Mr. WOODRUM. If we do not have money enough to keep the offices open for the year, we can make an additional appropriation when we come here in January.

Mr. BULWINKLE. You have enough money appropriated—you do not reduce the amount going to the hospitals.

Mr. WOODRUM. Oh, no; we are not going to reduce anything because of keeping these offices open. The gentleman knows that we will be back here in January.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, last evening the national commander, Mr. Johnson, had a conversation with the President, and issued a statement with reference to the Veterans' Act. I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the proceedings at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. The national commander of the American Legion is the man who came out the day after the economy bill was passed and told soldiers to be patriotic. I do not propose to have him get any national publicity after double crossing the veterans. [Applause.] I object.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. Of course I am defenseless in the presence of a request coming from the charming lady from Massachusetts, but I think we have had liberal debate on this matter and after the lady is through I shall object to any further requests.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I have been promised one half minute on this, and I want at least a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Indiana that after the lady from Massachusetts has finished her remarks, he may proffer a unanimous-consent request, if he so desires.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I was at the Veterans' Administration this morning and was told that there was enough money in the \$77,000,000 to keep all of the regional offices, but that if \$8,000,000 were used for that purpose, that amount must be taken away from hospital and other needed expenditures for veterans' care. I am stating a fact. We shall need the additional \$8,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the lady to the letter which the Veterans' Administration wrote to me in which it is stated they did have the money.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; but General Hines did not state that he would have all he needed for hospital care of the men if that \$8,000,000 were used for regional offices. At the hearings they told the gentleman that the money must come either out of the hospitals and other activities or the regional offices. I talked with General

Hines, and that is what I was told. We need the \$8,000,000 carried in the amendment. The paragraph on this section in the committee's own report of this independent offices appropriation bill clearly shows the need for this additional amount. The report reads as follows:

Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services: The appropriation under this heading has been reduced from \$111,273,634 to \$77,273,000, a cut of \$34,000,634. The reduction is accounted for partly by the additional 6½ percent salary cut, and partly by curtailment of hospitalization resulting from the President's Executive order made pursuant to the act to maintain the credit of the United States. Among other measures which will be adopted to bring about the reduction it is intended to abolish all the regional offices.

I pray that the President will liberalize his extremely severe regulations. Before the regulations went into effect I asked him to be liberal. I realize the terribly difficult task that he has. I also know that he asked us to give him the power to regulate veterans' benefits. He had repeatedly said he wanted justice for the veterans. General Hines has been very bitterly attacked by these regulations. Have those attacks been fair? If something is done in your office or in my office by one of our office force that is wrong, is it not our responsibility? Until the Congress takes away the authority it gave to the President the responsibility belongs to him if the rules are unjust and to see that justice is done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GRAY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GRAY. I rise to let the Chairman comply with his agreement with me to grant me a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to address the Committee for 1 minute, notwithstanding the fact that he was promised a half minute. The Chair hopes the Committee will grant this request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I am not now and never have been in sympathy with that part of the economy program providing for the reduction or scaling down of wages or the reduction of pensions and disability allowances, the whole of which is being used and is necessary for wage earners and pensioners to live.

It is now the unanimously adopted, universally agreed, and the determination, conclusion, and judgment of all economic students and political economists that the depression has resulted and is being prolonged by a continued failure and destruction of the buying and consuming power of the masses of the people, brought about by a sudden fall of values, the price level, and the wage scale, and such cause has been found and determined by Congress and the administration and the remedy agreed and entered upon.

Regardless of the merits of existing pensions and disability allowances, and regardless of the wage scales, with the food and clothing commodity prices rising and where all earnings and income are being used and are insufficient or barely sufficient to provide the necessities of life and for the bare comforts and conveniences required for existence, reduction of such wages or disability allowances is an economic error which will intensify and aggravate the condition under which the people are suffering.

Everything I say here or I am trying to express regarding wages and wage earners I want to apply with equal force to pensions and the common soldier. And everything I say here regarding pensions and adjusted disability allowances awarded to the common soldiers is equally applicable to wages and wage earners.

It is an economic error to reduce wages and adjusted disability allowances before bringing a restoration of employment, an opportunity otherwise to provide the means to live. It is an economic error to reduce wages and disability allowances without and before restoring earnings, wages, and income necessary and required by men for their support and the support of those who by nature are dependent upon them.

It is more than an economic error to take from men the only means and income to live and leave them to suffer the stigma and humiliation of public or private charity.

It is more than an economic error to take from wage earners and the common soldier classes any part of their wages or income required to live and to provide for their families while wealth is left reveling in luxury and splendor with their surplus incomes untouched. It is a political and social misconception and oversight. It is a step without realization of the condition of the masses, without appreciation of the temper and mind of those suffering, in want and distress, in the midst of plenty and great abundance.

It is a false, hazardous, fatal maneuver to take from the thousands of men, women, and children their last means and substance and leave them standing before great mountains of food perishing for want of use, begging for labor, hungry and famished; leave them standing shivering before great mountain storehouses of clothing and raiment depreciating in waste, while they suffer cold and exposure.

It is more than an economic error, more than a political, social oversight, misconception, or hazard. It is a policy jeopardizing civil order. It is not only opening the door but is driving men on, goading them in desperate strain to take a stand in defiance and at bay, to maintain their right to live.

It will be vain and useless to counsel, advise, and urge private employers to raise wages and thereby restore buying and consuming power and inspire confidence in the policy urged, while we are reducing wages and disability allowances to soldiers, and thereby destroying the buying and consuming power by positive force of law among a great mass and multitude of people. Certainly we will lose the moral force of our advice and recommendation urged upon private employers if we deliberately follow a contrary rule to be observed with public employees and the holders of adjusted disabilities and pensions.

It is the desire and nature of all men to conserve peace and order and tranquillity under which to live and rear their children. It is their ambition to pay and meet their obligations as they mature and maintain themselves in loyalty and patriotism in obedience to the law and the support of their government and the existing order of things established by custom and usage in the course of life.

But the natural impulse of men to live, to provide for themselves and those who by nature are dependent upon them, is a higher and more controlling impulse in men than to pay taxes, meet their obligations, or even to abide by the law. The impulse to live is a higher and more controlling impulse in men than to observe peace and order. And when men are compelled to choose between the impulse to live and the obligation to pay taxes and observe the laws of the land they will choose to act under the natural impulse to live. By taking away from men the means to live and provide for those and theirs we will be driving men to choose and act under the higher and more controlling impulse of nature, the impulse of men to live.

With the farmers of 17 States already declaring for a farm holiday; with 14,000,000 people unemployed, living on half or insufficient rations, in enforced idleness, in a land of plenty and great abundance; with soldiers returning from the battlefield, where they breathed the fatal breaths of gas, bared their breasts to steel, the mowing machine guns, to give property its worth and value and make secure liberty and human rights, now marching in rags and tattered raiment, hungry, without shelter, begging at the door of industry and of those whose property they gave value and worth for a bare living sustenance; with laboring men organized and united, demanding without recognition their share of the fruits of their toil and labor; with a movement looking to the organization uniting all these common labor, toiling factions to make common cause for their right to live upon the earth and enjoy the fruits of their toil—surely there is a failure of a proper appreciation of conditions and of the state of the wavering mind and the tense impulse induced by want and suffering and distress in the midst of plenty and great abundance.

There are many flagrant abuses of the pension system which must be remedied, eradicated, and cured in the interest of the honest and deserving soldiers and to save the pension system from discredit and the pensioners from disrepute and suffering a revolt from the overburdened tax-paying public. But even these abuses and these unjustifiable pensions should not be summarily adjusted, reduced, or cut off and the pensioners, long led to rely upon this source of income, left without means or sufficient opportunity for employment to provide for themselves and their families the vital necessities of life.

We are now to realize a rise of values and the price level, which will automatically increase the cost of living, and which calls for readjustments on a higher level of wages, pensions, and disability allowances, and which rise of values and the price level I have long favored and now favor as the only way for economic recovery and a restoration of normal prosperity. When conservative values and price level have been reached, as they must be reached and stabilized, then wages, pensions, and adjusted disability allowances must be promptly readjusted to a higher level of values and commodity prices. Before that time comes no fair or equitable readjustment can be made.

Balancing the Budget is flaunted as a prosperity measure to restoring the earnings and income of the people. It has no such a relation either as farm or industrial relief. The Budget must be balanced, not because it will restore prosperity to the people but because the honor, dignity, and credit of the Government must be upheld and maintained before the people and the nations of the world. The people are left with less after the Budget is balanced than before, and with a policy of reducing wages and soldiers' adjusted compensation to balance the Budget, they are reduced by both withholding and taking from them.

But the Government's Budget is not the only budget to be balanced and kept balanced. The wage earners and the common soldiers have a budget to be balanced, not only to maintain their honor and credit before their fellow men but to provide the vital necessities for themselves and those who by nature are dependent upon them and look to them for support and maintenance.

The Federal Budget is largely balanced from imposed taxes and excise duties levied upon the vital necessities of life and more largely used, consumed, and paid by the masses of the people than the certain special few, owning and controlling 80 percent of the wealth of the country and taking a like amount of the national income. Certainly, any further taking necessary to balance the Budget ought to be taken from the owners of the 80 percent of the property and the takers of a like amount of the national income, instead of withholding from the owners of the 20 percent of the property and from those taking a meager part of such income.

I voted for the economy measure in approval of many provisions and with mental reservations, passive resistance, and in disapproval of some provisions. I voted for the economy measure first, because there was no opportunity allowed to separate what I approved of from what I disapproved of. And second, I voted for the economy measure because I felt and realized it my solemn and imperative duty to maintain the united support and solidarity of the new administration before the country, then facing a crisis, to maintain peace, order, and stable government before the wavering public mind. And I would so vote again under like conditions and facing the same emergency. But no such conditions are here to be met. This is a separate, independent measure. Solidarity of action upon this one section of the bill is not imperative to sustain governmental prestige before the country.

I shall vote to recommit this bill back to the committee for deliberate, regular, and orderly consideration to maintain existing wages, and adjust disability allowances until opportunity for employment, wages, and income and the consuming power of the masses shall have been restored.

MR. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on these amendments may have permission to extend their remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The first vote comes upon the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SHOEMAKER] to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SHOEMAKER to the amendment of Mr. McCORMACK: Strike out "\$85,273,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$110,538,514."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the McCORMACK amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: Page 44, line 6, strike out in line 6 the figures "\$77,273,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$85,273,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$8,000,000 of this amount shall be available for all expenses and maintenance of all regional offices of the Veterans' Administration."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOODRUM) there were—ayes 140, noes 29.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL: Page 46, line 15, after the colon, insert: "*Provided further*, That the appropriations herein made for medical and hospital services under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration shall be available, not to exceed \$5,000, for experimental purposes to determine the value of certain types of treatment."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pensions: For the payment of pensions, gratuities, and allowances, now authorized under any act of Congress or regulation of the President based thereon, or which may hereafter be authorized, including emergency officers' retirement pay and annuities, the administration of which is now or may hereafter be placed in the Veterans' Administration, \$231,730,000, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That Navy pensions shall be paid from the income of the Navy pension fund, so far as the same shall be sufficient for that purpose, and the amount so expended shall be accounted for separately.

Mr. LEMKE. I offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEMKE: Page 48, line 10, after the word "Administration", strike out "\$231,730,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$331,730,000."

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, in considering the appropriations in this bill a great deal has been said in regard to our national defense; we are told that we should subsidize the merchant marine, because they are a part of our national defense, but little has been said of the real national defense—the veterans of this Nation. Without soldiers, sailors, and marines there can be no defense; without them warships, submarines, and airplanes will stand still and cannons, machine guns, and rifles remain silent. Therefore, I am interested in the veterans—in the human side, in the human flesh and blood of our national defense. I witnessed several hundred of our beragged, tired, hungry, disheartened veterans with the flag of this Nation, marching by the House Office Building yesterday with policemen directing them off the Capitol Grounds, and I cannot help but think of the difference when these boys proudly marched forth to defend this Nation's honor and future glory, how we lauded and praised them then, and what miserable and contemptible treatment we have given them since and are giving them now.

While these boys went forth, willing to give their lives and their limbs for this Nation, many of the stay-at-homes wrapped the flag of glory around them and grabbed every-

thing in sight. They made millions and billions out of the blood, the tears, and the agony of an agonized world. During the war we made 17,000 new millionaires and a few billionaires. We paid common labor as high as \$8 and \$10 a day and ordinary skilled labor as high as \$20 to \$100 a day. But when these boys returned and asked, not for a just compensation, but merely a few paltry dollars with which to get a start in life again, then we yelled that if they insisted upon that they would wreck the Nation; that the national credit and honor were at stake.

The treatment of our soldiers and veterans during the war and since the war is a national disgrace. Quoting from the Chicago Tribune of May 21, 1920:

Every soldier knows the training camps were located not for training purposes but to bring money to favored communities.

Every soldier knows that of the money not deliberately misspent, fully one half was wasted, because it was administered by miserable incompetents appointed for political advantage.

Every soldier knows what an infinitesimal fraction of war-time expenditures ever reached the battlefield.

Every soldier knows that both his comfort at the rear and his safety on the battlefield were sacrificed.

Every soldier knows that throughout the war his interest was sacrificed to that of the slacker and profiteer.

Every soldier knows that the only suggestion of national economy has been to economize at his expense.

The bill under consideration is, so far as the veterans are concerned, carrying out the provisions of the so-called "economy bill" which we passed so hurriedly at the opening of this session. It is carrying out the provisions of the international bankers' Economy League bill—that we passed without knowing what it contained, and relying upon misinformation—it is carrying out these provisions with a vengeance, so far as the disabled veterans are concerned. It is carrying out these provisions under the most cruel, brutal, and inhuman suggestions made by the Director of the Budget Bureau, a young man of 38, utterly devoid of human feeling.

If we do not check this mad young man in his insane desire to become a coupon clippers' hero, he will virtually strangle the disabled veterans and their widows and orphans. These veterans upheld the honor and the glory of this Nation in the filth, the mud, the slime, the blood, and the gas in the trenches of foreign battlefields. They pulled the chestnuts out of the fire for our international bankers, who gave credit in the form of war material, food, and clothing to the Allied Governments to the extent of billions of dollars before we entered the war. These international bankers had bet on the wrong horse over in Europe and were about to lose when this Nation took up the gage of battle to make the world safe for democracy. Now, these racketeers ask that the soldiers' pension and disability compensation be cut so that they will be sure that there will be enough money in the United States Treasury with which to pay the interest on the bonds they hold.

Frankly speaking, if we do not check the Director of the Budget Bureau, not only he but this splendid administration, this humane administration, will go down in history as giving the most barbarous, the most cruel treatment that any government ever gave to its defenders and its protectors. Let us not permit that cruel stain to be put upon our Government—upon our manhood and decency—as Members of this Congress. We passed the so-called "national economy bill" under misinformation. Let us now rise to the occasion and make partial amends by at least letting up on the persecution of the disabled veterans. Let us call and stay the hand of this cruel peace-time hero, who has deserted his comrades. Let us say to him, "You will not be permitted to make a name for yourself as an efficiency expert at the expense of the disabled veterans and their widows and orphans; you will not be permitted to put that stain upon the American people."

Chickens are coming home to roost. At the time that the so-called "economy bill" was up for consideration, the Wall Street racketeers, who saw here a chance to cut their income tax, saw to it that we were flooded with hundreds of telegrams asking us, in the sacred name of the credit and honor of this Nation, to pass the so-called "economy bill." The

telegrams coming to us now bear a different message. They ask us to help save the disabled veterans and the widows and orphans of disabled veterans from becoming public charges; they ask us to help save their veterans' bureau, their veterans' hospital—begging for help they come, admitting that they have been misled, the same as this Congress.

Under these circumstances it is not too late for this Congress to correct its blunder. Let us have sufficient courage to amend this bill and to make sufficient appropriation to take care of the disabled veterans and of the orphans and widows of disabled veterans.

At the time that the economy bill was up, I suggested that so far as crucifying the veterans was concerned it was false economy. I suggested you could not bring back prosperity by adding to human misery. I suggested that we should practice economy where it ought to be practiced. I suggested that we should give the President authority to suspend the interest on the bonds of the United States for a period of 3 years. That would have put the burden of economy where it belonged—upon those who profited and made millions out of the blood, the misery, and the tears of an agonized world. We can still do this. Why not in this crisis, if this Nation's credit and honor are at stake, suspend the interest on these bonds?

In conclusion, permit me to ask you to stay the merciless hand of the Director of the Budget Bureau—the hand that would take pennies from dead men's eyes in no man's land, in the name of a false economy. This Nation owes a duty to the boys that so valiantly upheld its honor and its glory upon the foreign battlefields. Let us correct our blunders; let us liberalize our appropriation so that the President can liberalize the veterans' slashes.

The President, according to this morning's news, intends to liberalize these slashes of the veterans' disability compensation. I am with the President; I know he is sincere, and for that reason let us now give him enough money so that he can undo the wrong and the injustice that has already been done to many veterans. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] has expired.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition in favor of the amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to have 5 minutes. I do not believe we have been accorded our full time over here. We received only 1 minute on the other.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I will modify my request to make it 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I get 5 minutes I will not object.

Mr. KVALE. Reserving the right to object, I want to merely make sure that it applies only to this paragraph.

Mr. WOODRUM. To this paragraph and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, as I understand it, would increase the amount of money for the relief of veterans suffering from service-connected disabilities in the sum of \$150,000,000.

That amount is just about what would be needed to restore to those men with service-connected disabilities the amount they were receiving before this so-called "economy bill" was put into effect.

In other words, if this money were appropriated the President might make new regulations to restore the benefits that were previously paid to those men who were wounded in line of duty, those men who received service-connected disability.

At the time the economy bill was up for consideration we were told the President would be fair and just in the admin-

istration of that bill and in the making of regulations for the benefit of ex-service men. We were also told, at that time, that by enacting the so-called "economy bill" we would effect an economy or a saving of approximately \$385,000,000 or \$400,000,000. I do not wish to impugn any unfairness to the President of the United States, but I do want to say that any man who voted for the economy bill must have expected just exactly what we got, because we were told that if we passed the economy bill these reductions in benefits to ex-service men would come; and we got exactly what we were told we would get.

The estimates now are that we will save only \$375,000,000 on compensation to veterans, plus \$34,000,000 for hospital care, and \$50,000,000 on the fund to retire the adjusted-service benefits. So that actually we have cut the ex-service men about \$460,000,000. Thus, you got exactly what you voted for, and I hope no Member of this House will try to defend his vote on the economy bill by saying that the President promulgated regulations that were more drastic than he expected, because we were told exactly what was going to happen.

If you believe there should be some fairer treatment of veterans, if you believe that the regulations should be liberalized, there is only one way you can possibly show that you mean it, and that is by voting for this amendment or some such amendment, increasing the appropriation.

If you want the President to be fair, and the President stated that it is his intention to be fair, and I want to repeat I do not doubt the fairness of the President, I submit to you that if you expect to liberalize these regulations in line with the statement of the President recorded in the press this morning, you will vote for this amendment. You will be doing your duty by the President if you give him the money with which to restore the compensation to men suffering from service-connected disabilities instead of requiring him to ask Congress next January for a deficiency appropriation. That would not be fair to the people of the country.

The distinguished gentleman from West Virginia in closing his remarks a minute ago said, "Do not forget we are coming back here in January."

If we are coming back in January for a deficiency appropriation we are not being fair with the American people, for we told them we would not spend so much, yet we are spending more.

Let us be fair. The President said he intended to liberalize the rules. Back in your districts you would not say, "Yes; I favor returning compensation allowances to those men with service-connected disabilities." If there is a single man or woman in this House who would tell the soldier back home that he or she is against giving the former compensation for service-connected disabilities, I wish he or she would stand up; I would like to see such a person.

So vote for this increase and you will be fair not only to the veterans but to the people of the country and to the President. If you want the President to liberalize the regulations, give him the money so he can do it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think every Member should have definitely in mind the thing to which he gives approval when he votes for the \$231,000,000 that is recited in the bill. The minute you approve that amount as a sequel to the economy bill here is what you are doing: You are letting word go out to the ex-service man who is 24 percent disabled and who has bared his breast to the shot and shell of the Argonne and Chateau-Thierry that he is worth only \$8 per month. You are saying to the ex-service man who is 49 percent disabled that he is worth only \$20 a month.

When you approve this amount you also approve the presumption that he was physically fit when he went into the Army, even though he may have had some physical defect and patriotic fervor made him enlist, conceal physical defects, and fight for his country.

You also place approval on the fact that the wife, the little child, the little son or daughter of a veteran who died

from service-connected injuries is entitled to receive only \$20 a month.

Now, ask yourself this question: Would you be willing to have your kids go out and fight the battles of life and get for themselves a primary and secondary education for \$240 a year, or \$20 per month, particularly after you had made the highest sacrifice for this Nation?

You can express your approval of such an attitude by approving the \$231,000,000 in this bill.

Let me mention burial expenses. Seventy-five dollars is provided for funeral and burial expenses and transportation.

The boys who wrote the Executive order were so niggardly that they at first forgot to include the American flag to which the soldier is entitled.

Imagine a man who went into the Argonne, into Chateau-Thierry, or the St. Mihiel, and went through the mire of the shell holes and the rat-infested trenches with a bayonet fixed, crawling up behind a creeping barrage at 4 o'clock in the morning—and I was there—a man who fought for that flag, and yet they were so unmindful of his sacrifices that they forgot to give him the flag, and then went back and wrote it in the regulations. So out of great generosity they decided he could have a flag when he died so it could be placed over his casket.

They allowed \$75 to transport him and bury him. If he has \$75 to his credit in the Administration, the clammy, slithery hand of the Veterans' Administration will reach in and take away that last \$75. It is in the Executive regulations.

This is the thing you are going to approve with the \$231,000,000. Do not blame it on President Roosevelt. He does not know what is in the regulations. Blame it on the unsympathetic men who have operated the Veterans' Bureau all these years and who stand up coldly like a stone wall against the desires of the veterans, namely, General Hines and his corps down in the central office.

I just want you to know the thing you are going to approve when you approve the \$231,000,000 in the bill as written.

A widow of a Spanish-American War soldier gets only \$15. If she were the widow of a World War veteran, she would get \$30. I wonder why the difference in widows. The surviving child of a Spanish-American War veteran gets \$12 and the surviving child of a World War veteran gets \$20. Why the difference of \$8? Is there any difference in the children of those who fought for that flag, as a matter of fact?

Then, so far as medical care is concerned, for those who have service-connected disabilities, it provides that within the discretion of the Administrator in that big building down town he can provide it "as may be found necessary", but you put it in the hands of a man who has never shown any sympathy for the veterans, to determine whether or not they need such medical treatment.

If you want to approve all this sort of thing as a supplement to the economy bill, then vote for the \$231,000,000. If you want to give the soldiers a square deal, if you want to lift them out of the stink and agony and sweat in which they are found on the highways and byways and in the hospitals of the country today, then I say to you you would better raise it to the amount carried in the amendment. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, the kind of argument just made by the eloquent and attractive gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is not the kind of argument that is really going to help the American veterans today. The gentleman knows, and I know he knows, because he is a man of intelligence as well as of eloquence, that it would not matter if you put \$1,000,000,000 more in here. This would not give one red copper penny to any veteran, under the regulations, unless the President of the United States sought in his good judgment to change the regulations.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Not right now, if you please.

I want to plead with you again to give the President of the United States an opportunity to see the effect of the regulations that he has promulgated, and may I remind you that they have not yet gone into effect except as to hospitalization and some few other things.

Mr. HOEPEL. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. WOODRUM. Not just now, if the gentleman will permit me to continue.

We have very present evidence of the fact that the President is not insensible to certain inequalities that may come into these regulations and that he is ready to counsel with accredited representatives of the veterans and to treat the veterans just and fair. And I say to you that it is not fair to him, and I want to make an appeal to my Democratic colleagues on this side of the aisle, because, after all, it is your particular duty and your particular responsibility.

The President of the United States has not asked you for any more money for these pensions. If they are to be liberalized, he will liberalize them and let us give him an opportunity to do it. If he needs more money, he will come to the Congress, through the Budget, and ask for it, and we will be ready to give it to him.

I may also say to the House that this report comes to you as the unanimous report of the Appropriations Committee of this House, and I want to say further, with great respect and admiration for my Republican colleagues on this committee, that they are ready to cooperate and ready to give the President of the United States an opportunity and a chance to work out this very great problem that is just as close to his heart as it is to the heart of any man who sits on the floor of this House.

Mr. Chairman, it would be a vain thing to increase the amount of this appropriation. If these regulations show injustices to veterans, then I am ready to join with any Member of Congress as a delegation to wait upon the President and ask for their modification; and I think I know the American people well enough to know that if the President should refuse to lend ear to such an appeal, as I know he would not, this Congress can exercise its right to change the regulations by law. But I want to again plead with the House to give the President an opportunity to carry into effect these regulations and see the effect of them before we vainly add more money to this bill, which, as I have said, would not give one red copper penny to any veteran unless the regulations were changed.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

The question was taken; and on a division there were 63 ayes and 80 noes.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. LEMKE and Mr. WOODRUM as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 76 ayes and 119 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For military and naval insurance accruing during the fiscal year 1934 or in prior fiscal years, \$123,000,000.

Hospital and domiciliary facilities: For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize an appropriation to provide additional hospital, domiciliary, and out-patient dispensary facilities for persons entitled to hospitalization under the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, and for other purposes", approved March 4, 1931 (46 Stat., p. 1550), \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 48, line 24, substitute a comma for the period after the word "expended", and add the following: "Provided, That the facilities of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service are first utilized to full capacity where available."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is contrary to the regulations vested in the administration promulgated with authority

given by Congress, which is now the law until Congress changes it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk read as follows:

Adjusted-service certificate fund: For an amount necessary under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act (U.S.C., title 38, secs. 591-683; U.S.C., supp. VI, title 38, secs. 612-682), to provide for the payment of the face value of each adjusted-service certificate in 20 years from its date or on the prior death of the veteran, and to make loans to veterans and repayments to banks in accordance with section 507 of the act, as amended (U.S.C., supp. VI, title 38, secs. 642, 647, 650; act July 21, 1932, 47 Stat., pp. 724-725), \$50,000,000, to become available July 1, 1933, and remain available until expended.

#### DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, I wish to address myself to the present status of veterans' legislation that we now have before us.

We are now considering the present status of veterans' legislation appropriations for the Veterans' Administration. We have been told by the chairman of the subcommittee that we are to deduct \$460,000,634 in the operation alone of the Veterans' Administration, and \$7,740,411 is deducted in the rest of the bill for all departments the appropriations cover in this measure.

You gentlemen remember how speedily the so-called "Economy Act" was rushed through, without being referred to the regular committee. It was referred to a special committee, every one of whom was known to be favorable to the bill. It was put through without Members of Congress having an opportunity to read the provisions of the bill. We went into a Democratic caucus, and after the caucus had debated the amendment, agreeing to a 25 percent reduction, in keeping with the Democratic platform—after we defeated the move to bind the Democrats to support the so-called "economy bill" in the caucus, the economy committee together with certain Democratic leaders rushed into the House and, under a gag rule, put the bill through.

#### HOW THE BILL WAS PUT OVER

The people of the country are entitled to know, especially the veterans of the country are entitled to know, how this piece of legislation was enacted into law.

#### THE PROPAGANDA OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY LEAGUE AND THE UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

You are all familiar with the bitter campaign of propaganda carried on by the National Economy League and the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the Manufacturers' Association through the press, the magazines, and the radio, to poison the minds of the public against the rights of the disabled war veterans. Thousands of dollars have been spent in this ruthless campaign by these organizations to put over the program of the repeal of all veteran laws, all of which they have realized under this so-called "economy bill." And to think that such a program can be put over by a group of law violators themselves, such as the National Economy League who has been one of the chief leaders of this campaign of lies and misrepresentations carried on against the rights of the disabled veterans. The so-called "National Economy League" is now an outlaw organization and a violator of our corrupt practices act for they have failed and refused to file statements under its provisions, which would let the people of this country know how much it has cost big business to put over this so-called "economy bill" that has literally cut the throats of the disabled war veterans and their dependents.

The RECORD will show that a resolution was quickly adopted waiving all points of order against the bill and limiting debate to 2 hours, all of which time was placed in control of members of the so-called "Economy Committee." When the Democratic caucus was called there were not even any printed bills available for the Members to read and study, and the committee report on the bill was not available. The RECORD will show that very few minutes were given to those who opposed the bill. Very little opportunity was given to even speak upon it, and no amendments were permitted.

#### VETERANS AFFECTED

It affects the rights of more than a million disabled war veterans and their dependents. Many of us recognize the wrongs that were done under this method, under the rules and regulations promulgated by Director Hines and Mr. Douglas, and, according to the Stars and Stripes, this whole economy act and the rules and regulations thereunder has all been put over under the direction of Mr. Barney Baruch.

#### THE AMOUNT CUT

It seems that the veteran is to take a cut under this bill of \$460,000,634, even more than the \$400,000,000 it was said they would be cut when the bill was before the House.

When Director Hines was before the Senate Finance Committee, March 10, the matter was carefully gone into in the limited time of two hours and a half hearing. Two men were before the committee, Director Hines and Budget Director Douglas. The statement is made and itemized on page 40 of this confidential Executive session hearing, in which it was proposed that \$383,530,000 was to be deducted from the veterans. Mr. Chairman, I trust the membership of the House will carefully study the revised itemized account, contained in these hearings, as to how these sums of money have been deducted from the different war veterans and their dependents.

It is futile to try to amend this bill, as has been well stated, because after all, it is the so-called "economy law" that has done the damage, and under it the President has enacted his rules and regulations carrying into effect the \$460,000,000 cut to the veterans. What other cuts have we made? What other sacrifices have been made other than those placed on the veterans and the Federal employees? Hundreds of thousands of men have been let out of the Government service. Many departments have been consolidated, and what has been done toward taxing the wealth of this country? Wall Street is now receiving a bonus in interest paid them on tax-exempt Government bonds of more than \$725,000,000 annually, and this is the group that put over this so-called "economy bill." [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRUAX: Page 49, line 5, after the word "in", strike out "twenty" and insert "one"; and in line 6, strike out the word "years", and insert the word "year"; and in line 10, strike out "\$50,000,000", and insert "\$2,400,000,000."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, of course the amendment is subject to the point of order and I make the point of order. It is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TRUAX. I desire to be heard on the point of order. My amendment, Mr. Chairman, merely changes the time of payment from 20 years to 1 year. It merely changes the amount of the appropriation from \$50,000,000 to \$2,400,000,000 to pay the soldiers now. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, we authorized the President of the United States to expand the currency by \$3,000,000,000. There is no better place for that new currency than to pay these soldiers.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman kindly confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to do so. As I stated before, the only way in which this bill is changed is to make this payable in 1 year instead of 20 and change the amount from \$50,000,000 to \$2,400,000,000 to pay the soldiers' bonus now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The existing law would be materially changed if this amendment were adopted. The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. No part of the appropriations contained in this act or prior appropriation acts shall be used to pay any increase in the salary of any officer or employee of the United States Government

by reason of the reallocation of the position of such officer or employee to a higher grade since June 30, 1932, by the Personnel Classification Board or the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM: On page 52, line 8, strike out the word "since" and insert "after"; on page 52, line 9, after the word "commission", insert the following: "and salaries paid accordingly shall be payment in full."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, all amendments to the bill from this point on are prevented, and I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the balance of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I concur in that request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Mr. SHANNON. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask in open session that the committee offer an amendment to strike out section 12. That section is a clear violation of the rule as to an appropriation bill offering legislation which disturbs existing law. I ask the committee to offer that amendment. I ask in open session that the committee do that and not commit this Congress to a piece of petty larceny such as this is.

Mr. WOODRUM. Of course, the gentleman knows perfectly well that I have no authority—

Mr. SHANNON. Oh, the gentleman's committee has authority. This is taking \$150,000 from a lot of boys.

Mr. WOODRUM. The committee cannot agree to the amendment. That will settle that matter very quickly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that, according to the terms of the resolution, no amendment could be offered to this section of the bill unless the amendment came from the committee.

Mr. SHANNON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHANNON. I would like to have the rule read that bars me from offering this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the rule.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

No amendment shall be in order to sections 4 to 17, inclusive, except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Mr. MEAD. Reserving the right to object, under the rule no amendments are permissible, and I am not going to offer any objection on that point, but there are a number of irregularities that should be corrected. I am wondering if the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations would not allow at least 10 minutes' discussion after this particular part of the bill is read. For example, men who were called upon to work from the 1st to the 10th of July and were then denied their retirement, are denied repayment of that retirement in this bill. Then again, this bill reduces the compensation of injured workmen. I do not believe that was the intention of the committee. It, evidently, is an oversight. I think if the record could be corrected, at least the Senate could straighten it out.

The regular order was demanded.

The CHAIRMAN. This resolution was passed by the House, and the House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. The Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union would not have authority to grant the gentleman's request.

Mr. MEAD. Except by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Not even by unanimous consent in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

Sec. 5. Title II of the act entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", approved March 20, 1933, to the extent that it provides for the impoundment of appropriations shall not operate to require such impoundment under appropriations contained in this act.

Sec. 6. Whenever it shall appear to the President, in respect of any contract entered into by the United States prior to the date of enactment of this act for the transportation of persons and/or things, that the full performance of such contract is not required in the public interest, and that modification or cancellation of such contract will result in substantial savings to the United States, the President is hereby authorized, in his discretion, on or before April 30, 1935, to modify or cancel such contract. Whenever the President shall modify or cancel any such contract, he shall determine just compensation therefor; and if the amount thereof, so determined by the President, is unsatisfactory to the individual, firm, or corporation entitled to receive the same, such individual, firm, or corporation shall be entitled to receive such portion thereof as the President shall determine and shall be entitled to sue the United States to recover such further sum as, added to said portion so received, will make up such amount as will be just compensation therefor, in the manner provided for by paragraph 20 of section 41 and section 250 of title 28 of the United States Code: *Provided*, That where any such contract makes provision for settlement in the event of modification or cancellation, the amount of just compensation as determined hereunder shall not exceed such amount as is authorized by said contract. Any appropriation out of which payments upon the said contract were authorized to be made is hereby made available for the payment of such just compensation.

Sec. 7. Whenever the President, after investigation, shall find that the charge or charges established by or in accordance with existing law for any service rendered or article sold by any executive department, commission, or other executive agency of the United States is less than the cost of such service or thing determined by the President in accordance with sound principles of accounting, he is hereby authorized, in his discretion, by Executive order to increase such charge or charges in such amount as he may determine will return to the Government the cost of such service. The authority granted to the President to order increases in charges hereunder shall cease upon the expiration of 2 years after the date of the enactment of this act.

Sec. 8. (a) Whenever at any time hereafter prior to July 1, 1935, any employee of the United States or the District of Columbia to whom the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930 (U.S.C., title 5, ch. 14), applies, who has an aggregate period of service of at least 30 years computed as prescribed in section 5 of such act, is involuntarily separated from the service for reasons other than his misconduct, such employee shall be entitled to an annuity computed as provided in section 4 of such act, payable from the Civil Service retirement and disability fund, less a sum equal to 3½ percent of such annuity: *Provided*, That when an annuitant hereunder attains the age which would have been the retirement age prescribed for automatic separation from the service applicable to such annuitant had he continued in the service to such retirement age, such deduction from the annuity shall cease. If and when any such annuitant shall be reemployed in the service of the District of Columbia or the United States (including any corporation the majority of the stock of which is owned by the United States), the right to the annuity provided by this section shall cease, and the subsequent annuity rights of such person shall be determined in accordance with the applicable provisions of retirement law existing at the time of the subsequent separation of such person from the service.

(b) In making reductions of personnel due regard shall be given to the apportionment of appointments as provided in the Civil Service Act.

Sec. 9. (a) Until July 1, 1934, in cases in which the number of officers and employees in any particular service is in excess of the number necessary for the requirements of such service, the heads of the several executive departments and independent establishments of the United States Government and the municipal government of the District of Columbia, respectively, are hereby authorized to furlough, without pay, any officers and employees carried on their respective rolls for such periods as in their judgment may be necessary to distribute, as far as practicable, employment on the available work in such service among all the officers and employees of such service in rotation: *Provided*, That no employee under the classified Civil Service shall be furloughed under the provisions of this section for a total of more than 90 days during the fiscal year 1934 except after full and complete compliance with all the provisions of the Civil Service laws and regulations relating to reductions in personnel. Rules and regulations shall be promulgated by the President with a view to securing uniform action by the heads of the various executive departments and independent Government establishments in the application of the provisions of this section. The provisions of this section relating to furloughs shall not apply to carriers in the Rural Mail Delivery Service, but the President is authorized to suspend or to reduce for the duration of the fiscal year 1934 the allowance paid to such carriers for equipment maintenance.

(b) Section 216 of the Legislative Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1933, and such section as continued and amended for the fiscal year 1934, are hereby repealed.

Sec. 10. The President is authorized to place on furlough such officers of the Army, Marine Corps, Public Health Service, Coast

Guard, or Coast and Geodetic Survey, as he, in his discretion, shall deem desirable. While on furlough, officers shall receive one half the pay to which they would otherwise have been entitled, but shall not be entitled to any allowance except for travel to their homes.

SEC. 11. The President is authorized, in his discretion, to suspend the extra pay or reduce the rate of extra pay allowed to commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard while on flying duty, and to distinguish between degrees of hazard in various types of flying duty and make different rates of extra pay applicable thereto: *Provided*, That no such rate shall be in excess of \$1,440 per annum.

SEC. 12. So much of the act of August 5, 1882 (22 Stat. 285), as is contained in the proviso at the end of section 1057, title 34, United States Code, is hereby amended by repealing the words "and 1 year's sea pay", so that the said proviso will read as follows: "*Provided*, That if there be a surplus of graduates, those who do not receive such appointments shall be given a certificate of graduation and an honorable discharge."

SEC. 13. From the date of the approval of this act and until July 1, 1934, the compensation of all officers and employees of the insular possessions of the United States which is now fixed by acts of Congress and which is not subject to reduction under the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", approved March 20, 1933, is hereby reduced 15 percent: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed as applying to officers whose compensation may not, under the Constitution, be diminished during their continuance in office.

SEC. 14. For the period of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, remaining after the date of the enactment of this act and during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, the retired pay of judges (whose compensation, prior to retirement or resignation, could not, under the Constitution, have been diminished) is reduced by 15 percent.

SEC. 15. The compensation authorized by sections 3, 4, and 10 of the act of September 7, 1916, as amended, accruing during the fiscal year 1934, shall be reduced below the amounts prescribed by the said act by the same percentage as that prescribed for the reduction of compensation of officers and employees under section 3 of title II of the act entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", approved March 20, 1933: *Provided further*, That the monthly pay as defined in section 40 of the act of September 7, 1916, shall be determined without regard to the temporary reductions in pay required by the act of March 20, 1933: *Provided further*, That the funds made available for the purposes of the act entitled "An act for the relief of unemployment through the performance of useful public work, and for other purposes", approved March 31, 1933, shall be available for the payment of compensation for injuries as required by section 3 of said act, but such payment shall be made through the Employees' Compensation Commission.

SEC. 16. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, every pension payable under any private relief act, not subject to the provisions of sections 1 and 17 of title I of the act entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", approved March 20, 1933, shall, irrespective of the provisions of section 18 of title I of such act, be reduced by the same percentage as that prescribed for the reduction of compensation of officers and employees under section 3 of title II of said act.

SEC. 17. This act hereafter may be referred to as the "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1934."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, under the rule, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. BULWINKLE, the Speaker pro tempore, having resumed the chair, Mr. McCLELLIC, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5389) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BULWINKLE). Under the special rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded upon any amendment?

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask a separate vote on the McCormack amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: Page 44, line 6, strike out "\$77,273,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$85,273,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$8,000,000 of this amount shall be available for all expenses and maintenance of all regional offices of the Veterans' Administration."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit the bill. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York, a member of the committee, is recognized to offer a motion to recommit, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, upon this motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. When we vote to recommit, we do not vote against the cancellation of contracts on air mail, do we?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit the bill. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 116, nays 255, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—116

Allen	De Priest	James	Rogers, Mass.
Andrew, Mass.	Dirksen	Jenkins	Seger
Andrews, N.Y.	Ditter	Johnson, Minn.	Shoemaker
Arens	Dondero	Kahn	Simpson
Bacharach	Douglass	Kelly, Pa.	Sinclair
Bacon	Dowell	Kinzer	Stalker
Beedy	Dunn	Knutson	Stokes
Black	Eaton	Kurtz	Strong, Pa.
Blanchard	Edmonds	Kvale	Sutphin
Bolleau	Eltse, Calif.	Lemke	Swick
Bolton	Englebright	Luce	Taber
Britten	Evans	Lundeen	Taylor, Tenn.
Brumm	Focht	McGugin	Thurston
Burke, Calif.	Foss	McLean	Tinkham
Burnham	Frear	Mapes	Tobey
Carter, Calif.	Gibson	Martin, Mass.	Traeger
Carter, Wyo.	Gilchrist	Merritt	Treadway
Cavichia	Goodwin	Millard	Turpin
Chase	Gray	Mitchell	Watson
Christianson	Guyer	Mott	Welch
Clarke, N.Y.	Hancock, N.Y.	Muldowney	Whitley
Cochran, Pa.	Hartley	Murdock	Wigglesworth
Collins, Calif.	Healey	Parker, N.Y.	Withrow
Condon	Hess	Peavey	Wolcott
Connery	Hoepfel	Perkins	Wolfenden
Connolly	Hollister	Powers	Wolverton
Crowther	Holmes	Ransley	Wood, Mo.
Culkin	Hooper	Reece	Woodruff
Darrow	Hope	Rich	Zioncheck

NAYS—255

Adair	Caldwell	DeRouen	Granfield
Adams	Cannon, Mo.	Dickinson	Green
Allgood	Carden	Dickstein	Greenwood
Arnold	Carley	Dies	Gregory
Ayers, Mont.	Carpenter, Kans.	Dingell	Griffin
Ayres, Kans.	Carpenter, Nebr.	Dobbins	Griswold
Bailey	Cartwright	Dockweiler	Haines
Beam	Cary	Doughton	Hamilton
Belter	Castellow	Doxey	Harter
Berlin	Celler	Drewry	Hastings
Biermann	Chapman	Driver	Henney
Bland	Chavez	Duncan, Mo.	Hildebrandt
Blanton	Church	Durgan, Ind.	Hill, Ala.
Bloom	Clark, N.C.	Eagle	Hill, Knute
Boehne	Cochran, Mo.	Eicher	Hill, Samuel B.
Boland	Coffin	Ellzey, Miss.	Hoidale
Boylan	Colden	Faddis	Howard
Brennan	Cole	Farley	Huddleston
Brooks	Colmer	Fernandez	Hughes
Brown, Ky.	Cooper, Tenn.	Fitzpatrick	Imhoff
Brown, Mich.	Corning	Flannagan	Jacobsen
Browning	Cox	Fletcher	Jeffers
Brunner	Crosby	Fuller	Jenckes
Buchanan	Cross	Fulmer	Johnson, Okla.
Buck	Crosser	Gambrill	Johnson, Tex.
Bulwinkle	Crump	Gasque	Johnson, W. Va.
Burch	Cullen	Gavagan	Jones
Burke, Nebr.	Darden	Gillespie	Kee
Busby	Dear	Gillette	Keller
Byrns	Deen	Glover	Kelly, Ill.
Cady	Delaney	Goldsborough	Kennedy, Md.

Kennedy	Mansfield	Ramsay	Swank
Kerr	Marland	Ramspeck	Sweeney
Kleberg	Martin, Colo.	Randolph	Tarver
Kloeb	Martin, Oreg.	Rankin	Taylor, Colo.
Kniffin	May	Reilly	Taylor, S.C.
Kocalkowski	Mead	Richards	Terrell
Kopplemann	Meeks	Richardson	Thom
Kramer	Miller	Robertson	Thomason, Tex.
Lambertson	Milligan	Robinson	Thompson, Ill.
Lambeth	Montet	Rogers, N.H.	Truax
Lanham	Moran	Rogers, Okla.	Turner
Lanzetta	Morehead	Rudd	Umstead
Larrabee	Musselwhite	Ruffin	Utterback
Lea, Calif.	Nesbit	Sadowski	Vinson, Ga.
Lehr	Norton	Sanders	Vinson, Ky.
Lesinski	O'Brien	Sandlin	Wallgren
Lewis, Md.	O'Connell	Schaefer	Walter
Lindsay	O'Connor	Schuetz	Warren
Lloyd	O'Malley	Schulte	Wearin
Lozier	Oliver, Ala.	Scrugham	Weaver
Ludlow	Oliver, N.Y.	Sears	Weideman
McCarthy	Owen	Secrest	Werner
McClintic	Palmisano	Shallenberger	West, Ohio
McCormack	Parker, Ga.	Shannon	West, Tex.
McFarlane	Parks	Sirovich	White
McGrath	Parsons	Sisson	Whittington
McKeown	Patman	Smith, Va.	Wilcox
McMillan	Peterson	Smith, Wash.	Willford
McReynolds	Pettengill	Snyder	Wilson
McSwain	Peyser	Steagall	Wood, Ga.
Major	Pierce	Strong, Tex.	Woodrum
Maloney, Conn.	Polk	Stubbs	Young
Maloney, La.	Prall	Studley	

## NOT VOTING—60

Abernethy	Disney	Kemp	Rayburn
Almon	Doutrich	Kennedy, N.Y.	Reed, N.Y.
Auf der Heide	Duffey	Lamneck	Reid, Ill.
Bakewell	Fiesinger	Lee, Mo.	Romjue
Bankhead	Fish	Lehlbach	Sabbath
Beck	Fitzgibbons	Lewis, Colo.	Smith, W.Va.
Brand	Ford	McDuffie	Snell
Buckbee	Foulkes	McFadden	Somers, N.Y.
Cannon, Wis.	Gifford	McLeod	Spence
Claiborne	Goss	Marshall	Sullivan
Collins, Miss.	Hancock, N.C.	Monaghan	Summers, Tex.
Cooper, Ohio	Harlan	Montague	Underwood
Cravens	Hart	Moynihan	Wadsworth
Crowe	Higgins	Pou	Waldron
Cummings	Hornor	Ragon	Williams

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Reid of Illinois (for) with Mr. Underwood (against).  
 Mr. Doutrich (for) with Mr. McDuffie (against).  
 Mr. Beck (for) with Mr. Bankhead (against).  
 Mr. Higgins (for) with Mr. Kennedy of New York (against).  
 Mr. Goss (for) with Mr. Auf der Heide (against).  
 Mr. Gifford (for) with Mr. Pou (against).  
 Mr. Somers of New York (for) with Mr. Ford (against).  
 Mr. Bakewell (for) with Mr. Ragon (against).  
 Mr. Lehlbach (for) with Mr. Cravens (against).  
 Mr. McLeod (for) with Mr. Fiesinger (against).  
 Mr. Marshall (for) with Mr. Lamneck (against).  
 Mr. Waldron (for) with Mr. Harlan (against).  
 Mr. Moynihan (for) with Mr. Duffy (against).  
 Mr. McFadden (for) with Mr. Sullivan (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Snell.  
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Cooper of Ohio.  
 Mr. Collins of Mississippi with Mr. Wadsworth.  
 Mr. Summers of Texas with Mr. Buckbee.  
 Mr. Almon with Mr. Reed of New York.  
 Mr. Disney with Mr. Fish.  
 Mr. Montague with Mr. Spence.  
 Mr. Williams with Mr. Crowe.  
 Mr. Brand with Mr. Claiborne.  
 Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Lee of Missouri.  
 Mr. Romjue with Mr. Monaghan.  
 Mr. Hart with Mr. Lewis of Colorado.  
 Mr. Fitzgibbons with Mr. Cummings.  
 Mr. Kemp with Mr. Smith of West Virginia.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOODRUM. If the House should adjourn now, would the first order of business tomorrow be the vote on the passage of the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This would be the unfinished business and therefore the first order of business tomorrow.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KLOEB, for Monday and Tuesday, May 15 and 16, on account of important business.

## FARM MORTGAGES

Mrs. JENCKES. Mr. Speaker, I have just been successful in stopping the foreclosure of an Indiana farm mortgage. I propose at a later date to tell more of the farm-mortgage situation in Indiana, but I rise now to ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record by inserting therein the brief that I have prepared.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mrs. JENCKES. Mr. Speaker, I have just been successful in preventing the foreclosure of a mortgage on an Indiana farm, and I propose to address the House on this subject at a later date. I now ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record by inserting a short brief on the unfair conditions surrounding certain farm mortgages held by our Federal land banks.

The brief is as follows:

On April 28, 1933, Mr. Samuel L. DeMars, a citizen of Lebanon, Ind., telegraphed Representative VIRGINIA E. JENCKES, advising that the Connersville (Ind.) National Farm Loan Association, C. E. Brookbank, secretary-treasurer, had recommended foreclosure proceedings on a mortgage on his 177-acre farm on account of the removal of some timber of little or no value. The Federal Land Bank of Louisville, Ky., Mr. A. G. Brown, vice president, approved this action, notwithstanding the fact that the loan was not delinquent, and also notwithstanding that Mr. DeMars has owned the farm for 6 years.

Upon receipt of the telegram from Mr. DeMars, Representative JENCKES personally called upon Mr. Paul Bestor, president of the Federal land bank, Washington, D.C., and requested that he issue the necessary orders to hold up the foreclosure until she could make an impartial investigation. Mr. Bestor immediately communicated with Mr. Brown, and the foreclosure was held up. The Federal Land Bank of Louisville, Ky., advised Representative JENCKES by telegram that the reason for the foreclosure was that Mr. DeMars had cut some timber from the farm and that the farm was "grossly neglected", and that while the loan was not delinquent the foreclosure was warranted. Representative JENCKES immediately telegraphed the Federal Land Bank of Louisville, Ky., to hold up the foreclosure until she could make a fair and impartial investigation, as it had been brought to her attention officially.

Mrs. JENCKES' investigation developed the following information, which is supported by affidavits on file in Mrs. JENCKES' office:

(1) A sworn statement over the signature of Mr. Alonzo P. Faulkinbury, real-estate dealer, of Boone County, Ind., as follows: "That he has been engaged in the buying and selling of real estate for the past 10 years and that he has visited the farm of Mr. Samuel L. DeMars in Posey Township, Franklin County, Ind., and that he has observed the timber growing thereon, and that he believes the timber growing on the farm 2 years ago was second-growth timber; that the farm is a rough farm not suitable for a grain farm; but that the same, when properly cleared, will be suitable for a stock farm, and that the second-growth timber would be worth very little if anything on the market, and that the removal of the timber would injure the value of the farm very little or none."

(2) A sworn statement by Mr. Cleo F. Green, of Boone County, Ind., who is the present tenant: "That he saw and inspected the farm after Mr. DeMars acquired it, and that the farm and improvements in general today are in at least twice as good condition as they were upon first inspection."

(3) A sworn statement by Mr. Elmon L. Walker, of Boone County, Ind., "that he has been engaged in buying and selling timber for 10 years and that he has examined the farm of Samuel L. DeMars, and that all of the timber is of little or no value to the farm; that the farm is not injured by the removal of the second-growth white poplar therefrom; and that the farm is worth as much without the timber as with it."

(4) A sworn statement by Mr. Cris Witmer, of Boone County, Ind., as follows: "That the farm is worth as much or more without the timber growing thereon, and that there are no evidences of the farm's being neglected."

(5) A sworn statement of Mr. Thomas A. Grant, 906 North West Street, Lebanon, Ind.: "He is familiar with the farm, has examined the farm on three different occasions; that the farm has not been neglected, and that the farm is in better condition now than when Mr. Samuel L. DeMars first obtained title to it, and that the timber cut has no cash value, and that valuable improvements have been made to the farm."

(6) A statement by Mr. Elza O. Rogers, a prominent member of the Indiana bar, of Lebanon, Ind., advises "that Mr. Samuel L. DeMars is a very high grade citizen; he is engaged in the grocery business in Lebanon, Ind., and expected to have this farm for his old age."

On May 9, 1933, Representative JENCKES filed certified copies of these affidavits with Mr. Paul Bestor, president of the Federal Land Bank of Washington, D.C., with the request that he direct the

Federal Land Bank of Louisville, Ky., to immediately terminate all foreclosure proceedings in the DeMars loan and to accept any settlement Mr. DeMars might care to make, if any.

Representative JENCKES also requested President Bestor to advise her immediately if the Federal Land Bank of Louisville refused to do this, in order that Mrs. JENCKES might ask for a congressional investigation of this loan and all other loans of a similar character where farmers were subject to the loss of their farms for unreasonable conditions.

Here is a case of where an Indiana farmer was threatened with the loss of his farm due to incomplete investigation on the part of the Federal land-bank agencies. This is contrary to the "new deal" promised farmers, and as an Indiana farmer, as well as a Member of Congress, I am prepared to ask the Congress and President Roosevelt to intervene to prevent such unfair foreclosures.

Mrs. VIRGINIA ELLIS JENCKES,  
Member of Congress.

#### WICHITA NATIONAL FOREST AND GAME PRESERVE IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an excerpt from a Government bulletin giving information on the Wichita National Forest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to state that the director of the forest camps now being established under the Reforestation Act recently passed by Congress has today announced the designation of one camp of 200 men for a period of 6 months to be located soon in the Wichita National Forest and Game Preserve in Oklahoma. I have just returned from the White House where the President signed the order establishing the camp in this area. The purpose of this camp is not only for forestation, but included also in the program are some important flood-control and erosion projects; several lakes, ponds, and earthen basins are to be constructed on this reservation of more than 61,000 acres and, when the entire project is completed, it will convert this national forest, already picturesque and beautiful with its trickling streams and shady nooks, mountains and lakes, into a veritable paradise.

The announcement today of a forest camp in the Wichitamas marks a new era in the development of that region, and generations yet unborn will rise up and bless those who are responsible and who have been leading the fight in Oklahoma for governmental participation in a real, comprehensive, and constructive program on this reservation.

I wish it were possible to name all of those who have been outstanding in this great movement, but time does not permit. Let me say in passing that to the Izaak Walton League of Oklahoma goes the lion's share of the praise. My lamented friend, the late Judge Burford, of Oklahoma City, was one of the originators of this movement and made several trips to Washington in an effort to convince what then seemed to be an unfriendly Forest Service of the practicability and public demand for lake improvement in the Wichitamas.

I have in mind many other gentlemen who have been patient but enthusiastic in an endeavor to secure adequate consideration by the Government for this important project. I wish I could name them all. In passing I think it is only fair to say, however, that both of our distinguished United States Senators from Oklahoma, as well as the entire delegation in Congress from our State, have cooperated in this undertaking in a wonderful way.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that soon after my first election to Congress I began urging what was then known as the "Izaak Walton League program" in the Wichita Mountains. At first the Forest Service did not look with favor on the projects, but later was induced to send a representative to Oklahoma to make a survey of the situation, and we were given assurance by a representative of the Forest Service that at least a large part of our program would be recommended to Congress. Because of the economic conditions, however, the promised recommendation never materialized.

When the President's reforestation program was presented to Congress our delegation from Oklahoma supported it to a man, not because we believed that our State would secure a great amount of benefit under its provisions but because of

our desire to stand by the President and help him in his unselfish desire to put 250,000 idle men to work.

The Wichita National Forest and Game Preserve, however, fits into the President's program in every particular. The projects proposed in the Wichitamas come clearly under the provisions of the act. Although the Forest Service has been very reluctant to give the Wichitamas any consideration until now, let me say that the local forester, Harry French, has been enthusiastic and helpful in support of a construction program. I am glad to say it is largely because of his recommendation that I am enabled to announce that the untiring efforts of those sponsoring this program have finally culminated in a successful conclusion.

Let me say that in this area the citizens of the city of Lawton, Cache, Indianola, Okla., and surrounding cities, towns, and communities have cooperated in this great undertaking. For example, the progressive citizens of Lawton, believing that native rock could be used in construction work and that concrete dams are unnecessary for holding water, especially in the smaller lakes, put in an experimental project in that area a few years ago with rubble masonry, known as "Lost Lake." The dam was constructed some 35 feet in height, and although several feet of water runs over it at flood stages it has shown no signs of weakness, although for years it has held up under the pressure of 35 acres of water.

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that last year more than 300,000 people visited the Wichita National Forest and Game Preserve, showing clearly that the public is vitally interested in this oasis that God has placed in the center of our almost treeless plains.

The realization of this dream that many of us have had for several years will when accomplished convert the Wichita National Forest and Game Preserve into one of the real beauty spots of the great Southwest.

The following quotations are taken from Miscellaneous Circular No. 36, issued by the Forestry Service, and will, I believe, be of especial interest to the public. It is not only interesting but authentic information:

#### LOCATION

The Wichita National Forest and Game Preserve is a tract of 61,500 acres, embracing the major portion of the Wichita Mountains in southwestern Oklahoma, the entire area lying within Comanche County. It is 117 miles southwest of Oklahoma City and 60 miles north of Wichita Falls, Tex., on the Quanah branch of the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway. The Ozark Trail, a transcontinental automobile highway, leading from St. Louis to Amarillo, Tex., where it intersects the Santa Fe Trail, passes 4 miles south of the forest boundary at Cache, Okla. The Meridian Highway, a north-and-south through route, comes within 6 miles to the west. The city of Lawton, Okla., is 16 miles southwest, and the Fort Sill Military Reservation (50,000 acres) adjoins the national forest on the east.

#### HISTORY

Southwestern Oklahoma is rich in historical interest. Between 1850 and 1860 Generals Sheridan, McClellan, and Scott campaigned in the Wichita Mountains and the surrounding prairies against the Kiowa, Comanche, and Wichita Indians. Geronimo, famous Apache chief, was held a prisoner at Fort Sill for some 25 years, until his death in 1911. Quanah Parker, last chief of the Comanches, made his home immediately south of the present boundary of the Wichita National Forest for 40 years prior to his death on February 23, 1911.

#### TREE GROWTH

When compared with the bountiful hardwood forests of the Appalachians, the pineries of the South, or the magnificent timber of the Pacific Northwest, the somewhat scrubby and scattered white-oak groves of the Wichita National Forest seem insignificant. Nevertheless, when one considers the hundreds of square miles of almost treeless prairies which stretch away beyond the range of vision on all sides from the Wichita Mountains, these shady groves, sheltering springs of sparkling mountain water and affording delightful resting places for relief from the heat of the plains, assume an importance both economic and esthetic.

#### TREE PLANTING

About 15 years ago six plantations were started on the forest. These are designated as Cedar Creek planting, Panther Creek planting, Elm Springs planting, Pleasant Valley planting, Reck planting, and Baker Peak planting. Native juniper, Osage-orange, black locust and honeylocust, black walnut, and mulberry were planted. Some of the plantations have been very successful and are among the show spots of the forest. The juniper and Osage-orange plantations known as Cedar Creek planting and Elm

Springs planting are almost perfect stands with forest conditions completely established.

These planted groves serve as excellent refuges for birds and game and have justified themselves from that standpoint alone. A more extensive program of planting is being considered on the basis of economic as well as wild-life value.

#### WILD LIFE

Knowing that the newly established Wichita Game Preserve embraced some of the best grazing grounds of what was once the great southern herd of American buffalo, it occurred to Dr. William T. Hornaday, director of the New York Zoological Park, that an opportunity had been created for the founding of a Government bison herd under exceptionally favorable conditions.

In view of the light snowfall in Oklahoma, and the fact that millions of buffalo had previously inhabited the plains of Oklahoma and Texas all the year round, subsisting by grazing, it seemed evident that it would be entirely possible for buffalo to maintain themselves on the Wichita National Forest in the same way. Since no species of large quadrupeds can be bred and perpetuated in the confinement of zoological parks and gardens, even where the enclosures are as large as those of the one in New York, it was believed that the only way to insure perpetuation of the buffalo would be through the creation of herds maintained by the Government on large areas of grazing grounds.

The grazing grounds are practically surrounded by several high round-topped or rock-capped hills, and cliffs and ridges of red granite. Heavy growths of blackjack oak cover most of the slopes, and near the bases of the elevations blackjack and post-oak groves extend down into the level country for a quarter of a mile. In several portions of the forest there are trees 60 feet in height. The mountains, hills, and timber together afford abundant shelter for the buffalo from the fiercest storms of winter.

#### VALUE FOR RECREATION

Situated just aside from a main transcontinental highway, in the center of a vast open-prairie country and yet within easy reach of populous sections of the Southwest, the Wichita National Forest and Game Preserve is rapidly becoming a public recreation center of great value. The Forest Service recognizes that public recreation is an important national-forest resource. It invites the public to come, use, and enjoy the forests and places no restrictions upon such use or enjoyment except the ordinary common-sense requirements as to sanitation and care with fire.

The area lying to the south of the scenic highway, known as the "Lost Lake and Camp Boulder region", is dedicated to recreational use. Six choice areas have been designated as public camp grounds and are being made more convenient and enjoyable as rapidly as funds are provided to finance the necessary sanitation, water supply, and playground improvements. The use of these areas is free to all.

#### SCENERY

In scenic value the Wichita National Forest and Game Preserve ranks high among the national forests of the country. Geologists affirm that the Wichita Mountains are the oldest mountain range in continental United States, and even to the untrained or unscientific eye their appearance seems to bear out this assertion. Disintegration is far advanced, and the countless strange and interesting formations, coupled with indescribably beautiful colorings resulting from the play of the elements upon the crumbling rocks, yield scenic effects at once unique and of compelling attractiveness. The forested groves are cherished by the local people; they grant you that the Wichita National Forest and Game Preserve is the property of all the people, but in their eyes it particularly belongs to their part of Oklahoma and the sense of prideful ownership is strong.

No matter how much one enjoys the beauty of the Wichita Range in general, the buffalo, elk, deer, and antelope, the birds, the trees and flowers, the hours in the campfire's friendly circle, no visit to this national forest is complete without a jaunt to Boulder Canyon, where West Cache Creek breaks through the mountains into the open plain. Here the forces of nature have combined to create a Garden of the Gods in miniature. The towering canyon walls, the rugged peaks, the jumble of massive boulders, and the delicate and ever-changing colors are profoundly impressive. And with it all there is the crystal stream, edged by wooded and grass-carpeted parks—ideal camping grounds where thousands whose homes and workshops are in the cities or on the prairies may and do find rest and the joy of life close to nature in her most pleasing moods and aspects.

#### REGIONAL OFFICES, UNITED STATES VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. STUDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a telegram from Dr. George J. Lawrence, commander American Legion, Department of New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STUDLEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following telegram received by me from Dr. George J. Lawrence, commander American Legion, Department of New York:

NEW YORK, N.Y., April 26, 1933.

HON. ELMER E. STUDLEY,

House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

American Legion here in New York State registers strenuous opposition to proposal of committee handling veterans' appropriations which would eliminate all Veterans' Administration regional offices and discharge 6,000 employees. Under such an arrangement a grave injustice would be done to the disabled veteran, both from the viewpoint of adjudicating his claim and the hospitalization phase. I cannot urge too strongly that you oppose that move. May I hear from you?

DR. GEORGE J. LAWRENCE,

Commander American Legion, Department of New York,  
305 Hall of Records, New York City.

#### MY PROTEST AGAINST THE UNJUST TREATMENT OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE IN GERMANY BY ADOLPH HITLER

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein a protest against the unjust treatment of the Jews in Germany by Hitler.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor to protest against the brutal and unwarranted treatment of the nationals of Jewish extraction in Germany by Adolph Hitler.

Our forefathers fled from oppression to New England. We from that section especially sympathize with any persecuted race. Our heritage demands that a protest be made. Some will say that we should not interfere with the private affairs of the German people or with the internal affairs of that country. We must take note of such unjust and inhuman treatment as has been dealt out in Germany of late.

This race, so renowned for its ancient culture, its love of peace and simple living, has been persecuted for 30 centuries. The Jewish people have been driven from land to land, until they have become wanderers seeking a haven of rest and contentment in a world which does not hesitate to profit by their standards of culture and their example of loyalty to family and home.

America is deeply indebted to more than 300,000 young Jewish men who responded to the call to arms in 1917 and 1918. Their relatives are being subjected to this unwarranted treatment in Germany today. They are being driven from their homes. They are being forced to abandon their trades and professions without recourse to trial or law. They ask for nothing but simple justice—an opportunity to pursue the even tenor of their ways.

Under the Versailles Peace Treaty they were promised protection with other German minorities. They were granted all civil and political rights enjoyed by German nationals. They have the right to expect that these promises will be fulfilled.

Is it little wonder that these oppressed people look to America for help? When we recall the early history of our own Nation we must expect the eyes of the less fortunate to be turned toward us for help. The action of the Hitler regime is so contrary to our ideas of justice and good government that we cannot at first comprehend the severity and cruelty of it all.

The Hitler order is directed against such renowned men as Albert Einstein, the scientist; Richard Willstätter, the chemist; Max Liebermann, the painter; and Jacob Wassermann, the novelist. Even their books and scientific researches are being burned in Germany today. It may be jealousy. It may be vindictiveness. Whatever it is, it is wrong. It is an outrage against a peaceful, home-loving people.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including therein a letter from the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the majority leader if he could tell us what the

program is going to be tomorrow outside of the pending vote?

Mr. BYRNS. There are several rules on the calendar which will be in order, provided they are called up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But the gentleman from Tennessee does not know what they are?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee should give us full information, he would be compelled to say that some of them are good and some of them are bad. I can say that; but, as our majority leader, he cannot thus prognosticate.

Mr. BYRNS. I am not passing judgment on any of them.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman is just telling us what the order of business will be. He is not indicating any preference.

Mr. BYRNS. There are several rules on the calendar.

One is a resolution by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], and relates to the investigation of bankruptcies.

Mr. CELLER. The investigation is to be made by the Judiciary Committee of the House and not by a special committee.

Mr. BYRNS. Then there is the Sirovich resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That provides for an investigation of the moving-picture industry.

Mr. BYRNS. Yes. Then there is one that will be offered in a moment relating to the suspension of mining assessments in the West. I do not know whether there is any other rule or not.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is a discharge rule, but I do not suppose that will come up tomorrow.

Mr. BYRNS. I was not aware of that, and that could not come up tomorrow under the rule anyway.

#### ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report from that committee for printing under the rule, which was referred to the House Calendar:

#### House Resolution 138

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 7, an act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States and Alaska, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Mines and Mining, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### NOVEL WAY FARMERS BENEFIT BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AID

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one half minute.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell us on what subject?

Mr. PATMAN. I want to ask unanimous consent to put something in the Record and I want to describe what it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress and all the people are interested in any plan that will assist farm families in bettering their condition and especially any plan that will better enable these families to produce their living at home by preserving and canning the wonderful fruits, vegetables, and meats grown on the farm. We are also interested in knowing how the Reconstruction Finance Corporation money can be used to the very best advantage. The county in Texas where I was born and reared has recently benefited so greatly by the farmers working for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for \$1 a day building plants and turning the money back for steam-pressure cookers, preparing themselves to live at home and have cotton for a cash crop, I believe the plan is interesting from a na-

tional standpoint; its publicity will probably cause the people of other counties to adopt similar methods.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement about this work that was prepared by Mr. Victor H. Schoffelmayer, of Dallas, Tex.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how long is the description?

Mr. PATMAN. I assure the gentleman it is not lengthy. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY VICTOR H. SCHOFFELMAYER, AGRICULTURAL EDITOR OF THE DALLAS MORNING NEWS, DALLAS, TEX.

Cass County recently established a high-water mark when within 1 week its business men, farmers, extension forces, and vocational agriculture teachers distributed 100 steam-pressure cookers, mostly of the hotel size, and their complement of sealers to communities in 85 school districts out of a total of 102 in the county. This achievement was made possible because of the teamwork among the forces of such towns as Atlanta, Linden, Marietta, Hughes Springs, and Avinger, all backing a common program, in which the work of Miss Willie Terrell, home demonstration agent; M. C. Jaynes, county agent; George D. Holland, secretary of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce and teacher of vocational agriculture in the high school; and F. B. Sullivan, occupying a similar position at Linden, stands out foremost.

There are many more men to mention, such as T. R. Richey, chairman of the county committee for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; E. W. King, president of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce; A. O. Brabham, president of the Atlanta Rotary Club, which played host to the 300 persons who attended the distribution day celebration; and others.

#### FINANCE IDEA IS NOVEL

The distinctive feature of the Cass County canning program is this:

Funds for the purchase of the canning equipment were provided by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation committee after Mr. Holland, Mr. Jaynes, and others had worked out a method by which each community desiring to install a community canning plant received the sum of \$45. This money was actually paid to farmers in each community as a wage of \$1 a day, allowing 45 days for a man to erect a community canning house of native pine logs or other home material.

This wage of \$45 in turn was paid back by farmers to a central committee, which was empowered to buy the steam-pressure cookers and sealers in such volume as to insure savings. Without the Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds it would have been largely impossible for the various communities to have raised the necessary money. Furthermore, without a central community canning plant the communities could not have been mobilized as a whole to share in the benefits of such food canning.

Now that the equipment has been distributed, Cass County will launch the greatest food preservation campaign in its history, which is expected to exceed greatly the 650,000 cans and glass jars of home-raised food put up by the farm women last year.

#### PRELIMINARY SPEAKING TOUR

In order to arouse the remotest community in Cass County, Mr. Jaynes and his cooperators got 65 business men and bankers from Cass and adjoining counties to take part in a whirlwind speaking campaign at every schoolhouse at night meetings for a month previous to the final placing of the canning equipment. The best of spirit prevailed at all times. The eastern side of Cass County was worked under direction of Mr. Holland, and Mr. Sullivan had charge of the central districts. The home demonstration agent and county agent worked all parts of Cass County, but concentrated on the western side. These forces carried the message of the need for providing an adequate home food supply in every community and thus become absolutely independent of Red Cross and Reconstruction Finance Corporation aid next winter.

A total of 6,792 persons attended the community meetings of which 3,000 were adults. From Marion County John Ericson, veteran county agent, came to aid in the campaign. The Texas & Pacific Railway lent its agricultural agent, Cy M. Evans. From Marshall came Bryan Bialock, former manager of the chamber of commerce there, and T. B. Cameron. Roy W. Snyder, meat specialist of the extension service, gave demonstrations how to prepare home-killed meat for canning. Women specialists assisted Miss Terrell in teaching the farm women leaders of each community so that they could not only lead in canning and preserving their own food, but could carry the knowledge into the nearby communities. In this way the work became cumulative in scope.

#### BUILD PINE LOG HOUSES

Soon the sound of razor-edged axes through the wooded hills of Cass County and community canning plants of glistening barked pine logs took shape. These were 20 by 24 feet and 8 feet high each, fitted with a furnace of ironstone native to the county. Also, there were built-in benches and tables along the walls of each community house. Those erected in sections outside of the piney woods used commercial saw timber and native stone. The log buildings were properly chinked with mud to make them tight. In a few weeks the earliest garden vegetables and products of the

fields will be put up in these plants, with each community setting aside days for members to do their canning in group action.

Mr. Holland completed the arrangements for purchase of the 100 canners and sealers, which cost roughly around \$4,000. Two different makes were bought.

#### COMMUNITIES HAVE THEIR DAYS

Toward the end of April the different communities took part in the various distribution days, Atlanta leading with a total of 43 canners; Linden second with 28; Marietta, 17; Hughes Springs, 7; Avinger, 5. There were special speakers at these different celebrations. Now all the communities have a definite objective. More gardens have been planted than ever before. Extra rows of sweet corn or field corn have been added. While every farmer grows some cotton, all of them now raise their supply of food.

Surrounding counties are making preparation to go in for similar projects as did Cass County. County agents and home agents, secretaries of chambers of commerce, and bankers are interested in adopting definite food programs which will insure their people against shortage.

So far the season has been backward in northeast and north Texas. There is no certainty that as much food will be raised as is necessary to supply the farms unless special efforts are put forth. Farmers have no money with which to buy food or feed, so they are making every effort to grow it. The Cass County example will be stimulating in many parts of Texas.

#### NEW REGULATIONS FOR VETERANS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the proposed regulations reducing veterans' benefits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, the White House announcement appearing in the newspapers this morning is of interest to all veterans in my district. The proposed liberalization of the regulations reducing veterans' benefits is the most humane course to follow at this time. I am glad to state that I fought the passage of the so-called "economy bill" because of the unjust provisions contained therein, and I voiced my objections to its provisions in a letter to the President on March 24. I feel that my plea, together with the hundreds of others he received, was of material assistance in bringing about the revision which will take place under the President's new orders.

My letter to the President was as follows:

MARCH 24, 1933.

HON. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,  
President of the United States,  
The White House, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Painful as the task is for me to describe the dark side of the Federal employees and veterans' affairs, it sometimes becomes a matter of duty and necessity. I desire to inform you candidly of the discontent which at this moment prevails universally.

The complaints of evils, particularly with the veterans, which they suppose almost remediless, are the total lack of money or the means of existing from one day to another, the heavy debts they have already incurred, the loss of credit, the distress of their families, and the prospect of poverty and misery before them. It is useless, Mr. President, to suppose that veterans will acquiesce contentedly with small rations, when many of those in a civil walk of life are enjoying certain privileges and recreations. While the human mind is influenced by the same passions and have the same inclinations to indulge, this cannot be. A veteran has the same predilection to sociability as a person in civil life. He conceives himself equally called upon to live up to his rank, and his pride is hurt when circumstances restrain him.

The act to maintain the credit of the United States gives you the power to determine the actual percentage of reduction. It has been generally expressed that your consideration will be fair and just to all. I trust you will, in the case of Federal employees, exempt salaries of \$83.33 a month (\$1,000 per year) or less from the proposed reductions and temper the cut to other low-salaried workers.

In the case of veterans, I feel sure you will bear in mind the fact that this country has been rescued by their armies from impending ruin, and our debt of gratitude should not remain unpaid.

Very truly yours,

ALFRED F. BEITER.

#### CURTALMENT OF THE WORK OF THE NAVAL RESERVE

Mr. LEHR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD three short letters relative to curtailment of the work of the Naval Reserve.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it has not been the custom in the past

to permit the insertion of such letters. I shall not object, because that is the duty of the majority; but I may say it is contrary to custom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEHR. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from George W. Akers, of Detroit, also a memorandum of the Secretary of the Navy and a letter to the President:

DETROIT, MICH., April 27, 1933.

HON. JOHN C. LEHR,  
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LEHR: Apparently well-authenticated rumors come from Washington that executive cuts of the Army and Navy appropriations for the coming fiscal year contemplate the complete elimination of drills and field and ship training for the National Guard and Naval Reserve.

The necessity of the National Guard as a vital arm of our national defense and State protection is well known, and its certain impairment by the withdrawal of Federal support would take years to overcome, even if we were so fortunate as to maintain a peace-time condition.

The drilling units of the Naval Reserve, being confined to 83 cities and comprising only about 1,200 officers and 8,800 enlisted men, is not so well known, but is perhaps even more vital to the national defense. With all naval vessels undermanned, many of them rotating in commission and others out of commission entirely, the immediate availability of the drilling units of the Naval Reserve is absolutely necessary to just get what ships we now have ready to go to sea.

Should this country be called upon to fight a defensive war, the Navy would have to have these trained men if it hoped to prevent our land forces, including the National Guard, from being thrust into battle before they were ready. In fact, one of the cardinal features of the present plan of rotating ships in commission is this immediate availability of the Naval Reserve.

The total Naval Reserve appropriation is only about 1 percent of the Navy appropriation. Any savings effected are bound to be insignificant as compared with the total savings required, yet the elimination of drills and ship training means about an 85 percent cut of the Naval Reserve budget. No ship training was given last summer, and it was definitely a set-back to the morale and efficiency of this force. Should training be again denied this coming summer, the result would be well-nigh fatal.

Drill attendance without pay was tried in 1921 and 1922 and was not satisfactory, even though cruises with pay were authorized at that time. The cruises were attractive to recruits and were the main incentive for drill attendance, but when the novelty wore off the recruit would drop away. The result was a continuous recruiting campaign, a turnover of upward of 80 or 90 percent, and training and instructions limited to the rudiments for those few who appeared at the armories on drill nights. How much less satisfactory will drilling be with drill pay and training duty both eliminated?

The nominal drill pay of the individual members of the National Guard and Naval Reserve is today in a substantial majority of cases, their sole means of support. If this is taken away, an additional burden is bound to be thrown on the local welfare agencies. The Federal Government will thus be enabled to unload a comparatively small amount of expense onto the States and municipalities, but it will lose the training investment it has made in thousands of the most patriotic of its young men, most of whom give freely of their leisure time, over and above the actual drill requirements, to increase their value to the national defense and to become better citizens.

As representative of one of the foremost States in patriotic and national-defense activities, won't you protest this proposed disproportionate cut of one of our necessary national services?

Sincerely yours,

GEO. W. AKERS.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, April 25, 1933.

From: The Secretary of the Navy.

To: All ships and stations.

Subject: Local emergency-relief work by Naval Reserve.

1. The Secretary of the Navy takes great pleasure in bringing to the attention of the service the valuable aid rendered by the Naval Reserve during the recent earthquake in the vicinity of Long Beach, Calif.; during the recent Ohio River flood at Cincinnati; and during the search operations off Barnegat, N.J., in connection with the wreck of the U.S.S. *Akron*.

2. Under the provisions of law the Naval Reserve may not be called out without their own consent except during war or a national emergency. No funds are contained in the annual appropriations for active-duty pay or allowances for Reservists except training duty or active duty in connection with the instruction, training, and drilling of the Naval Reserve, and the amounts are barely sufficient for these purposes. The duties performed by individuals or organizations of the Naval Reserve during local emergencies are therefore entirely voluntary and without pay or allowances.

3. During the earthquake emergency in southern California the presence of ample regular forces obviated the necessity for calling upon local Reserve organizations for patrol or other rescue work. However, through the network of volunteer-communication Reserve stations, most of which are owned and operated by Reservists themselves, communication was established with the stricken area and with the outside world within less than 2 hours after the first shock. When the emergency call went forth, practically all volunteer-communication Reserve stations within the stricken area were manned, and remained in operation continuously until commercial communication lines were reestablished the following day. A large number of messages were handled, principally for the Red Cross and the California National Guard, dealing with the emergency.

4. A sudden flood emergency developed at Cincinnati, Ohio, Saturday night and Sunday, March 19, on account of the overflow of the Ohio River and its tributaries. This emergency became critical on Sunday morning and, at the request of the mayor, the local Naval Reserve division was mobilized and the volunteer-communication Reserve network was placed in operation for maintaining communications throughout the stricken area. Eighty-five percent of the Naval Reserve division promptly responded to the call and performed patrol and relief work until Monday morning, when most of them were obliged to return to their regular employment. The mayor requested that official orders be issued maintaining them on duty for a longer period, but this could not be done under the law. As in the case of the California and other disasters, the volunteer-communication Reserve functioned in sending and receiving emergency messages dealing with relief wherever commercial communication lines had failed or did not reach.

5. In connection with the search problem involved on account of the wreck of the dirigible *Akron*, about midnight of April 3, it was necessary to utilize the services of Naval Reserve aviators and Naval Reserve planes from the Naval Reserve aviation base at Floyd Bennett Field, N.Y., and the Naval Reserve aviation base, naval aircraft factory, Philadelphia. About 3 a.m. of April 4, news of the disaster having reached the stations, the various Naval Reserve aviation officers and men belonging to the organizations were communicated with by telephone, and at daylight all available planes from both stations began taking off to participate in the search over the sea. This hazardous and exacting duty was continued by various Reservists day after day until the search was discontinued on April 7. As in other disasters, volunteer-communication Reserve stations were manned and communications maintained with the searching planes and with the district headquarters. The unusual communication load placed on district headquarters at Philadelphia was handled by Naval Reservists, who stood regular radio watches, and several acted as radio operators on the planes and assisted in the search. Approximately 100 Naval Reserve officers and men qualified for the performance of this duty, volunteered therefor, and actual flying was performed during the search by approximately 20 Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve aviation officers.

6. The best traditions of the naval service have been upheld by the Naval Reserve during these emergencies.

CLAUDE A. SWANSON.

APRIL 29, 1933.

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,  
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: According to information in the press and otherwise which I have received, it appears that a considerable reduction in appropriations for the Regular Army is being considered, as well as for the training of the R.O.T.C., the C.M.T.C., and Reserve officers.

I supported your economy program because I felt that it was perfectly justified in view of all the circumstances and conditions in which we find ourselves, but I do wish to go on record as being strongly in favor of an adequate national defense, and I hope and trust that nothing will be done which in any way will tend to affect adequate national defense, both for the Army and Navy. I believe that the peace and security of this country should not be jeopardized by economy in this line, and in particular I wish to urge that no reduction be made in appropriations for the training of the R.O.T.C., C.M.T.C., and Reserve officers. I feel that because of your own experience during the World War and your intimate knowledge of the conditions as it existed then, you will agree with these sentiments.

In brief, I feel that this is one place in which we dare not sacrifice efficiency for the purpose of economy.

Respectfully yours,

J. C. LEHR, Member of Congress.

#### HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the floor leader announced earlier in the week that we would adjourn tomorrow afternoon over Saturday, I should like to ask the floor leader if he has any objection to meeting at 11 o'clock tomorrow instead of 12 in order that those who want to take a week-end trip may have an extra hour in which to get away?

Mr. BYRNS. Personally I have not the slightest objection to meeting at 11 o'clock tomorrow if that is satisfactory to the House.

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. I should like the majority leader to put the request.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, in line with the suggestion of the gentleman from Kentucky, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the House, in accordance with its previous order, adjourned to meet tomorrow, Friday, May 12, 1933, at 11 o'clock a.m.

### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

#### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(Friday, May 12, 10 a.m.)

Continuation of the hearings on H.R. 5500. The Emergency Transportation Act, 1933.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

60. A letter from the secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting report of the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the first quarter of 1933, January 1 to March 31, 1933, inclusive, and for the period from the organization of the corporation on February 2, 1932, to March 31, 1933, inclusive (H.Doc. No. 34); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

61. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of a proposed bill, the purpose of which is to enable the Treasury to afford relief to holders of national-bank notes, Federal Reserve bank notes and Federal Reserve notes, which may not be redeemed under present law because they have been so defaced that the identity of the issuing banks cannot be ascertained; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

62. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution to amend the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928 for the purpose of extending for 1 additional year from March 10, 1933, the time within which American nationals who have obtained awards from the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, or from the Tripartite Claims Commission, United States, Austria, and Hungary, may make application to the Treasury for the payment of such awards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

63. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved January 21, 1927, a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 27, 1933, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, containing a general plan for the improvement of Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn., for the purposes of navigation and efficient development of its water-power, the control of floods, and the needs of irrigation (H.Doc. No. 38); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H.R. 3524. A bill to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 874); without amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CORNING: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 5394. A bill authorizing Charles V. Bosser, his heirs and assigns, to construct, maintain, and oper-

ate a bridge across the East River between Bronx and Whitestone Landing; with amendment (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. House Joint Resolution 118. Joint resolution to provide for the return to the Philippine Islands of unemployed Filipinos resident in the continental United States, to authorize appropriations to accomplish that result, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 138. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 7, an act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States and Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 128). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin: A bill (H.R. 5607) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes', approved September 7, 1916"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H.R. 5608) to amend sections 13 and 14 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, with respect to rediscount powers of the Federal Reserve banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota: A bill (H.R. 5609) to authorize owners of resort property and certain retail business establishments to secure from the home-loan banks loans secured by mortgages, and to authorize such banks to lend to members on the security of such mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H.R. 5610) to extend and broaden the powers of local administration of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, promote the efficiency of the local government therein, and assist the Congress in dispatch of its business; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H.R. 5611) to provide for the forfeiture of vessels, vehicles, or other means used to transport or conceal unstamped narcotic drugs, or to facilitate the purchase and sale thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution (H.Res. 142) providing for the consideration of S. 158; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLACK: Resolution (H.Res. 143) requesting the Secretary of State to instruct the American delegates to the World Economic Conference not to enter into any arrangements or understandings affecting Spain, Mexico, or Germany, directly or indirectly, until the Governments of these three countries give assurances that all religious persecutions in their countries shall be ended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PARKER of Georgia: Joint resolution (H.J.Res. 179) designating May 22 as National Maritime Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH: Joint Resolution (H.J.Res. 180) to exempt admission to the Second Gymnastic Festival of the American Sokol Union from the admission tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin: A bill (H.R. 5612) for the relief of William J. Graff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK: A bill (H.R. 5613) for the relief of the children of William Wheeler Hubbell and his wife, Elizabeth Catherine Hubbell, both deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H.R. 5614) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Laidig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 5615) granting a pension to William Cloyd Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARLAN: A bill (H.R. 5616) granting a pension to James F. Deal; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KRAMER: A bill (H.R. 5617) for the relief of Harry McCollister; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H.R. 5618) granting a pension to Mary L. Burgess; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H.R. 5619) for the relief of Francis M. Dent; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEEKS: A bill (H.R. 5620) granting a pension to Herman Samuel Coons; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H.R. 5621) granting a pension to Emma Hodge; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SANDLIN: A bill (H.R. 5622) for the relief of Joseph Crockett Cleveland; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

999. By Mr. ARENS: Petition of E. N. Myers, secretary North Western Carmen's Association, St. Paul, Minn., protesting against the continuance of the waste of public funds through the diverting of freight to an extravagant and hugely subsidized competing form of transportation, approving President Roosevelt's position that waterway projects included in the public-works program should be confined to projects that are self-liquidating and for the use of which facilities a tonnage tax can be collected on water craft sufficient to pay for the maintenance of such waterways as well as to eventually retire the Government's investment therein, and favoring the investigation of the feasibility and practicability of water transportation on the upper Mississippi; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1000. Also, petition of Capt. Martin O. Ness, International Shipmasters Association, Duluth, Minn., opposing any reduction in personnel or appropriations for national defense appropriated by the last Congress, and also if appropriations are reduced for personnel in the Regular Establishment for the civilian components should be increased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1001. Also, petition of the Minneapolis Hide & Tallow Co., 240 Gateway Building, Minneapolis, Minn., retail and wholesale meat dealers of Minnesota, urging the Congress of the United States for the immediate consideration of adequate duties on all imports of animal, marine, and vegetable oils and fats, as well as the oil content of all raw materials from which such oils and fats are processed, and also adequate duties on hides and skins; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1002. By Mr. BACHARACH: Petition of Mayor Nathaniel Rosenfeld; Woodbine Clothing Co.; Baron de Hirsch Lodge, No. 222, I.O.O.F.; George Feldman and Harry Feldman, residents of Woodbine, N.J.; William C. Hunt, of Wildwood, N.J.; and the Wildwood Chapter of Hadassah, Wildwood, N.J., protesting against the inhuman acts of the Hitler government against the Jewish race; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1003. By Mr. BERLIN: Petition of Greensburg (Pa.) Jewish community at a public meeting under the auspices of Greensburg Lodge, No. 194, U.S. Order Brith Sholom, protesting against the atrocities practiced upon Jewish people of Germany and urging action that will result in the discontinuance of discrimination against the Jews; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1004. By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: Memorial of King David Lodge, No. 120, Progressive Order of the West, M. Cytron, president, Al Cohen, secretary, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the persecution of Jews in Germany and urging action by the United States with a view to bringing about a speedy termination of discrimination against the Jews; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1005. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Brooklyn Council, Kings County, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, opposing all such issues of tax-exempt obligations and urging Congress to take the necessary procedure to prevent the issuance of such tax-exempt obligations in the future and also, where possible, to subject all existing obligations and the income therefrom to the tax laws of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1006. By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of Crippen-Fellows Post, No. 50, American Legion, Castleton, Vt., opposing removal of the regional office of the Veterans' Administration at Burlington, Vt.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1007. By Mr. GRANFIELD: Petition of the City Council of the City of Cambridge, memorializing Congress to enact House Joint Resolution 191 and Senate Joint Resolution 105; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1008. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of the Senate of the State of Texas, urging that the Wagner relief bill be amended so that funds appropriated thereunder may be used for the construction of roads; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1009. By Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota: Resolution of the International Shipmasters Association, of Duluth, Minn., expressing opposition to reductions in the Naval Reserve appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1010. By Mr. LESINSKI: Petition of the Wayne County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, urging retention of regional office of the Veterans' Administration at Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1011. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Steinway & Sons, New York City, piano manufacturers, opposing House bill 3759; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1012. Also, petition of William S. Gray & Co., New York City, opposing House bill 3759; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1013. Also, petition of National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, Washington, D.C., concerning the independent offices appropriation bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1014. By Mr. McCORMACK: Petitions of Patrick J. Connelly, president Dorchester Board of Trade, Dorchester, and employees of Aeolian-Skinner Organ Co., Inc., 215 Sydney Street, and Albre Marble & Tile Co., Inc., 64 Mount Vernon Street, Dorchester; American Stay Co., 299 Marginal Street, East Boston; Barney & Carey Co., Dorchester and Milton; Block Jones Photo Co., Inc., 27 Von Hillern Street, and Boston Insulated Wire & Cable Co., 65 Bay Street, Dorchester; D. R. Campbell Machine Co., 55 Mildred Avenue, Mattapan; Frost Coal Co., 488 Neponset Avenue, Freeport Marble &

Tile Co., 264 Adams Street, Harrison Square Foundry Co., 110 Gibson Street, Healey-Seaver Co., 90 Freeport Street, McGovern Coal Co., 188 Geneva Avenue, Joseph Pollak Corporation, 79-85 Freeport Street, and Shawmut Engineering Co., 195 Freeport Street, Dorchester; and Thompson Wire Co., 41 Mildred Avenue, Mattapan, all of the State of Massachusetts, protesting against the passage of the so-called "Black-Connery 30-hour week labor bill", referred to Committee on Labor.

1015. Also, petition of the United Irish-American Societies of New York, James MacDermott, secretary, 205 East Sixty-seventh Street, New York City, opposing further reduction of foreign debts due the United States and the transferring of the weight of European war debts to the shoulders of the already overburdened people of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1016. By Mr. McFARLANE: Petition of the Texas House of Representatives, urging amendments to the Wagner bill so that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds to be appropriated to the Texas Relief Commission may be used for the building of good roads; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1017. By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of the Common Council of Bridgeport, Conn., urging that the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the naturalization of Brig. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko be commemorated by the issuance of a memorial series of stamps; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1018. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Steinway & Sons, New York City, opposing the passage of House bill 3759; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1019. Also, petition of William S. Gray & Co., New York City, opposing the passage of House bill 3759; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1020. By Mr. TRAEGER: Petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, dated May 2, 1933, urging enactment of the Ludlow unemployment bill, H.R. 1553; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1021. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of California, dated April 26, 1933, urging a tariff on rubber, and to include in the Government supply bills a requirement that rubber purchased be grown in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1022. By Mr. WOLVERTON: Telegraphic petition of Samuel Shane, chairman, representing 2,000 citizens of Camden, N.J., protesting against the unjust persecution of Jews in Germany, and urging action that will result in the discontinuance of discrimination against the Jews; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.